REFERENCE

EN FROM THIS ROOM

PhD
1929
E

Boston University
College of Liberal Arts
Library

THE GIFT OF the Author

378.744
BO
Ph.D.1929
e
cl.

THE THEORY OF PROTO-LUKE IN RELATION TO THE FOURTH GOSPEL

by

Rhoda Christena Edmeston
(A.B., Denver, 1925; A.M., Boston, 1926)

A Dissertation
submitted in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

GRADUATE SCHOOL
BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1929.

Bible. N.T. Gospels
" " . Luke
" " . John
Series

40993

PhD
1929
C
copy 1

THE THEORY OF PROTO-LUKE IN RELATION TO THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

INTRODUCTION----------1.

1. The Subject Defined----------1.

2. The Main Divisions of the Subject-----2.

3. The Point of Departure in the Present Study----------3.

4. The Method Employed----------3.

I THE TWO-SOURCE THEORY IN SYNOPTIC CRITICISM----------4.

1. The Synoptic Problem----------4.

A. Definition----------4.

B. Importance----------5.

i. Literary

ii. Exegetical

iii. In relation to the Fourth Gospel

2. History of the Treatment of the Problem----------8.

A. In the early church----------8.

B. In the middle ages----------10.

C. In modern criticism----------10.

D. Classification of theories-------11.

3. Present Status----------17.

A. General agreements----------18.

B. The Two-Source Theory----------22.

II THE THEORY OF PROTO-LUKE----------25.

1. Limitations of the Two-Source Theory as Applied to the Third Gospel-------25.

A. Problems involved----------26.

i. As to omissions----------26.

ii. As to additions----------28.

iii. As to other variations------30.

B. Attempted solutions----------31.

i. Of omissions----------31.

a. A later insertion

b. Accident

c. Intention

d. Use of a mutilated copy of Mark

ii. Of additions----------34.

a. Difference of purpose

b. Additional sources

(a) Oral

(b) Written

(c) A number of sources

(d) One source

iii. Of other variations---------36.

2. The Proto-Luke Theory----------36.

A. Summary statement of the theory--36.

B. Streeter's presentation----------37.

i. Outline of the theory-------37.

ii. Authorship of Proto-Luke----39.
iii. Importance of the theory----41.
C. Vincent Taylor's presentation----43.
i. Outline of his work---------43.
ii. Conclusions reached---------44.
iii. Arguments for the theory----46.
iv. Content of Proto-Luke-------48.
v. Authorship and date of the document----------48.
vi. Importance of the document--49.
3. Historical Background of the Theory---49.
A. Points of contact with other theories of Lucan sources------49.
i. Burkitt--------------------50.
ii. Hawkins-------------------50.
iii. Burton-------------------52.
iv. Perry---------------------52.
v. Wickes--------------------53.
vi. Parsons-------------------53.
B. Theories of one continuous source----------54.
i. Feine---------------------54.
ii. B. Weiss and J. Weiss-------55.
iii. Wendt and Weizsacker--------55.
iv. Holdsworth----------------56.
v. Stanton--------------------56.

vi. Bartlett----------57.

vii. Sanday----------58.

4. Unique Features of the Theory---------58.

A. Authorship of the source---------58.

B. Non-Marcan framework----------59.

5. Evaluation of the Theory----------60.

A. The theory in contemporary criticism----------60.

i. Opposition----------60.

a. Perry

b. Loisy

c. Montefiori

d. Easton

e. Hunkins

f. Stephenson

ii. Favorable recognition-------64.

a. Taylor

b. Scott

c. Others.

B. Concluding estimate of the theory----------65.

6. The Proto-Luke Document----------65.

A. Content----------65.

B. Points of contrast with the Mk. - Mt. tradition----------69.

III SOURCE-CRITICISM OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL-----91.

1. Classification of Theories----------91.
2. The Traditional Position----------92.
A. Definition of the position--------92.
B. Defenders of the position---------94.
3. The Critical Position----------95.
A. Developments and adherents--------95.
B. Arguments----------97.
C. Conclusions: Definition of the Position----------99.
4. The Mediating Position----------100.
A. Definition----------100.
B. Adherents----------102.
5. Partition Theories----------105.
A. Definition----------106.
B. Development and adherents---------106.
6. Conclusion----------108.
IV THE FOURTH GOSPEL IN RELATION TO SYNOPTIC MATERIAL----------110.
1. Criticism and its Treatment of the Problem----------110.
2. The Problem in Relation to this Investigation----------117.
3. Points of Contact Between the Fourth Gospel and Canonical Luke----------117.
A. A statement of agreements.--------118.
B. Conclusion to be drawn therefrom--131.

4. The Extent of the Relationship---------132.
A. Linguistic evidence----------132.
B. The evidence from the location of agreements----------134.
C. The evidence of unique agreements----------135.
D. Conclusion----------138.
V PROTO-LUKE AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL----------140.
1. The Problem Defined----------140.
2. Five Possible Explanations----------140.
A. Lucan dependence upon the Fourth Gospel----------140.
B. Johannine dependence upon the Gospel of Luke----------141.
C. Johannine dependence upon Proto-Luke----------141.
D. Products of the same process of development----------143.
E. Common source or basis in a common cycle of tradition-------143.
3. Application of the Theory of a Common Source or Basis in a Common Cycle of Tradition----------144.
A. Significance of the method of the formulation of Proto-Luke----------144.

B. Application of the theory
to the linguistic situation-----145.
C. Application of the theory
to agreements in the two
documents----------146.
i. To agreements in a unique
presentation of material
found also in other
Synoptic tradition---------146.
ii. To agreements in the
presentation of unique
material----------150.
iii. To agreements in the type
of thought and common
interests----------151.
iv. To agreements with regard
to persons mentioned
in these documents only----153.
v. To the agreements in the
five Proto-Luke digressions
from Canonical Luke--------154.
D. Conclusion to be drawn therefrom--155.
4. The Theory of a Common Source in Re-
lation to the Source-Criticism of
the Fourth Gospel----------155.
5. Summary and Conclusion----------156.

VI SIGNIFICANCE OF THE THEORY OF A COMMON ORIGIN FOR PROTO-LUKE AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL------158.

1. For the Fourth Gospel----------158.

A. As to theories of source----------158.

i. Basis in an early tradition--158.

ii. The Zebedean authorship of the Johannine source-------161.

iii. Content of the source in the Fourth Gospel----------162.

B. Historicity of the Fourth Gospel--170.

2. For Proto-Luke----------171.

A. For the validity of the Proto-Luke theory----------171.

B. For the historical value of the unique material in Proto-Luke---172.

C. For the origin of the unique Lucan material----------173.

i. The Fourth Gospel tradition--173.

ii. Opportunity for contact with a Zebedean cycle of tradition----------174.

iii. The appeal for Luke of a Zebedean tradition---------176.

iv. Criticism of the common conception as to the origin of this Lucan material----------176.

INTRODUCTION.

1. The Subject Defined.

The subject which is to be considered in this investigation is, as the title indicates, the theory of Proto-Luke. This theory is of comparatively recent origin in the field of New Testament criticism and is to be studied here in the form in which it has been presented by Canon Streeter and more fully developed by Vincent Taylor.

As the title indicates also, it is to be considered here particularly in its relation to the Fourth Gospel. It is the aim of this discussion not to defend the Proto-Luke theory, although the arguments which are urged in its defense will naturally receive mention in connection with the presentation of the theory itself and a consideration of its development, but rather to set forth the theory, indicating the position it holds in the field of New Testament criticism and its historic connections with Synoptic criticism in general and Lucan criticism in particular, and to trace the steps by which it has arrived at its present recognition. Having viewed it thus in its historical perspective, and assuming its validity, we will go on to inquire what, on the basis of

such an assumption, can be ascertained regarding a relationship between the document Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel. If by a comparative study of these two we are able to discover any relationship existing between them and to make any definite decision as to the probable nature of this relationship, we shall proceed to inquire as to the significance of such a conclusion, for Proto-Luke on the one hand, and for the Fourth Gospel on the other.

2. The Main Divisions of the Subject.

The subject falls naturally into six main divisions. The first is a brief, and very general survey of the Synoptic problem and the treatment it has received in New Testament criticism, culminating in a slightly more detailed study of the Two-Source theory in particular. This forms the background of, or the approach to the real problem of this investigation. The second is a presentation of the Proto-Luke theory, its development and its historical connections with Synoptic criticism in general. The third is a brief review of the source-criticism of the Fourth Gospel to indicate the principal types of theories that have been put forward in this field. The fourth is a study of the Fourth Gospel in relation to Synoptic material with special

attention given to the question of its relationship with the Third Gospel. The fifth is an intensive comparative study of Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel for the purpose of determining what relationship, if any, exists between them. The sixth is an attempt to discover what bearing the conclusions arrived at in the preceding section have on the Johannine problem and on the Proto-Luke hypothesis.

3. Point of Departure.

Our point of departure is the Proto-Luke theory as it has been presented in present-day New Testament criticism, and the Johannine problem in the present stage of its development. Assuming the validity of the former, we will proceed from this point to inquire as to its significance for the latter.

4. The Method Employed.

The method to be employed is the historical-critical. Reviewing the work that has been done at each point, we will seek to state each position objectively first, and see each in its relation to the development as a whole. Afterwards some evaluations may be found necessary, and some deductions may be drawn from the positions that have been established.

I THE TWO-SOURCE THEORY IN SYNOPTIC CRITICISM.

1. The Synoptic Problem.

During the century and a half[1] in which the writings of the New Testament have been the subject of scientific investigation, no single question has attracted more attention or been more discussed than the so-called Synoptic Problem.

A. Definition.

The problem itself is too familiar to all who have any knowledge of New Testament criticism to require a labored definition. It will be sufficient to recall that it takes its rise in the phenomena presented by the first three gospels, and that the phenomena in question consist of a combination of similarities and differences which makes the problem baffling in the extreme. These three documents exhibit such striking resemblances as to content, order of arrangement of the material, and even in regard

1. Modern New Testament criticism began in the latter half of the eighteenth century with the work of Reimarus and Lessing.

to linguistic expression, that it is impossible to deny that a very definite relationship of some kind exists among them; that they are indeed "sister-works".[2] On the other hand there exist dissimilarities equally striking, so that it becomes exceedingly difficult to discover the nature of the relationship which binds them together. To find a theory that will account satisfactorily alike for these resemblances and differences, for the points of divergence as well as for the lines of coincidence--that is the Synoptic Problem. And it is precisely this two-fold character of the problem which creates the difficulty, for as we shall see, the theories whose strength is the satisfactory manner in which they explain one phase, are often found wanting as a means of accounting for the other.

B. Importance.

The importance which this problem has assumed in the field of New Testament scholarship can be readily understood. In and of itself

2. Jackson p. 431.

it would inevitably claim the attention of the N. T. investigator whose interest is purely literary, since it is fundamental in the understanding of one whole block of N. T. writings. But while it is, and must remain primarily a problem of literary criticism, and should be investigated with an unbiased disregard of results which may follow in other fields from the solutions which may be found, no one can fail to realize that these solutions will have tremendous significance for interests historical, religious, and theological.

Since these are the documents which purport to present the Person of the Founder of the Christian religion in his human relationships, and to present most directly the teaching which He imparted, an evaluation of their trustworthiness is naturally of great importance from a religious standpoint. But for such an evaluation no approach could be more important than a study of their origin and sources, including the question of mutual interdependence and relationships. It is of course true, as we shall have occasion to point out later in the present discussion, that chronological priority alone does not establish the historical trustworthiness of a document,

although it may point in that direction. Yet it is not to be denied that the vast amount of study and effort expended on the Synoptic Problem has been, is, and will continue to be, a valuable aid in discovering how much of historical trustworthiness is to be accorded these documents, since it makes it possible to separate legendary accretions from material which has come from earlier and more trustworthy sources. This, then, is an important secondary interest which Synoptic criticism serves.

It may be noted in addition that this problem is not unrelated to the criticism of other sections of New Testament writings; that it has indeed an important bearing on at least one other New Testament question, the much discussed and equally baffling Johannine problem. Dr. Stanton calls attention to this point in the following statements:

> "But while the history of the composition of the Synoptic Gospels forms a subject by itself, the view that we are led to take of it will at the same time have an important bearing upon the question of the historical character of the Fourth Gospel. For in order to estimate fairly the significance of the difference between their and the Johannine representations of the Person of Jesus and the course of His ministry, it will be

> necessary to ask whether their origin is such as to preclude the probabilities of incompleteness or even error in their accounts."[3]

2. History of the treatment of the problem.

So much for the threefold importance of the Synoptic Problem. The above discussion, while by no means exhaustive on this point, would seem to be sufficient to show that any contribution that can be made toward the solution of this problem, or any phase of it, cannot be entirely lacking in significance.

A. In the early church.

For the early church, in the years immediately following the time when these documents came into circulation and were recognized as having peculiar value, the problem of their mutual relations was of very minor importance. It is true that we do have suggestions that there was at least a faint realization of the existence of a problem created by the differences between them, since a few attempts were made by the church Fathers to

3. Stanton Vol. II, p. 2.

account for those differences. Origen, for example,

> "attributed it to a gradual rising or falling of inspiration to be explained by the human individuality of the respective writers and essays a reconciliation by a method of allegorical interpretation. Chrysostom attributes the brevity of Mark to Peter's terseness; Paul, he says, flows fuller than any river, hence the Third Gospel is of ampler range; when it is urged that the Evangelists are convicted of discordance, he replies that if their agreement be evidence of truth, the discrepancies serve but to deliver them from suspicion of having written by any human compact."[4] Augustine advances a theory of the dependence of Evangelist on Evangelist. Mark has produced an abbreviation of the work of Matthew."[5]

These, it will readily be admitted do not represent a determined wrestling with the problem after the manner of modern criticism. But they do show an openminded recognition of the existence of the problem in so far as its presence was sensed, which in the centuries which followed "well-nigh disappeared before dogmatic conceptions of the inerrancy of Holy Scripture."[6]

4. Chrysostom p. 4.

5. Augustine Bk. 1, Ch. 2.

6. Jackson p. 433.

B. In the Middle Ages.

This was the period of harmonies, when agreements were explained by theories of verbal inspiration, differences were ignored, contradictions declared to be impossible and differing accounts explained as the records of similar events occurring at different times; when to quote from a writer in a different connection "men smothered difficulties under a mantle of Christian love woven of traditional theories of inspiration."[7] It was not until the rise of modern literary criticism of the Gospels that the question was revived and attacked with a vigor worthy of the task.

C. In Modern Criticism.

The beginnings of this movement may be traced to Reimarus of Hamburg. He circulated a work in M.S. among his immediate acquaintances, and in 1768, six years after his death, selections from his works were given to the public by Lessing in the Wolfenbüttel Fragmente. In 1778 Lessing published his own work Neue Hypothese über die Evangel-

7. Jackson p. 433.

B. In the Middle Ages.

This was the period of harmonies, when agreements were explained by theories of verbal inspiration, differences were ignored, contradictions declared to be impossible and differing accounts explained as the reports of similar events occurring at different times; when to quote from a writer in a different connection was considered difficulties under a mantle of Christian love woven of traditional theories of inspiration.[7] It was not until the rise of modern literary criticism of the Gospels that the question was revived and attacked with a vigor worthy of the task.

C. In Modern Criticism.

The beginnings of this movement may be traced to Reimarus of Hamburg. He circulated a work in M.S. among his immediate acquaintances, and in 1768, six years after his death, selections from his works were given to the public by Lessing in the Wolfenbuttel Fragments. In 1778 Lessing published his own work Neue Hypothese über die Evangeli-

7. Jackson p. 633.

isten als bloss menschliche Geschicht Schreiber betrachtet. In England the publication in 1792 of a work by Evanson of Tewkesbury, The Dissonance of the four commonly received Gospels seems to mark the beginning of this type of investigation. Having been begun it was carried on with increasing vigor, in spite of some opposition, and varying treatments of the subject followed each other in quick succession.

It is not, however, the purpose of this treatment to trace in detail the development of the movement.[8] It will be sufficient to note here the various types of theories that have been advanced, and then to pass on to a discussion of the Synoptic Problem in present day thinking.

D. Classification of Theories.

The theories which have been set

8. For such a detailed study of the history of Synoptic criticism the reader is referred to Moffatt p. 177 ff, B. Weiss I.N.T. p. 203-219, and Zahn I.N.T. p. 400-427.

forth as attempts to explain the relationship existing between these three Gospels can be divided into two main classes; (a) those which explain it by positing oral tradition as the source of all three; (b) those which recognize the existence of written or documentary sources. The latter, however, may be subdivided into three groups. So that we have in reality four distinct types of theory.

i. Oral Tradition. The first of these according to which all three Gospels were based upon oral tradition, was first set forth by Herder,[9] and later elaborated by Gieseler,[10] and adopted by Godet.[11] In England its chief supporters have been Westcott[12] and Wright,[13] the latter being one of the few who still adhere to it at the present time. According to this theory the account

9. Weiss, B. I.N.T. quoting from Herder Regel der Zussammenstimmung unser Evangelien, 1797.

10. Gieseler pt. I.

11. Godet p. 549-567.

12. Westcott p. 165-211.

13. Wright p. 91-104.

of the life and teachings of Jesus was told and retold orally over a considerable period before being committed to writing. During this period it assumed a fixed form analogous to that of the legends of other peoples. By some it was thought that this tradition was deliberately made to assume a definite form to insure uniform instruction for catechumens. This fixity of form together with the retentiveness of the Oriental memory was thought to be sufficient to account for the similarities of the Synoptic Gospels. The differences were explained as those which would be likely to occur when an oral tradition was written by different persons with somewhat different purposes and widely differing circles of readers in mind.

It will be seen at once that the strength of this theory lies in its explanation of the differences in the three Gospels. Yet even here one might ask how a fixity of form which led to such minute coincidences as, e.g., that of the paranthetic expression in the account of the Healing of the Paralytic (Mk. 2:10b, Mt. 9:6b, Luke 6:24) could permit differences in a matter so important as those which occur in the account given by Paul of the institution of the Last Supper and

the accounts of the same event by Mt., Mk. and Luke.

When, in addition, we consider that the oral tradition must have been formulated in Aramaic, while the similarities in the Gospels extend to minute points in Greek, it becomes extremely difficult to see how these were preserved through the translation into a different language. It is not surprising, then, that the theory has been generally rejected by modern scholars.

ii. Among the documentary hypotheses, the one most closely connected with the theory just discussed is that of an Urevangelium or a single written source underlying our three gospels.[14] This theory was propounded by Lessing and developed by Eichhorn.[15] Such a document if used by each of the Synoptists would of course account for similarities but fails to explain the differences and the sections of material peculiar to the First and Third Gospels. To meet this difficulty the adherents of this theory have found it necessary to posit the existence of several suc-

14. Lessing p. 112-134.

15. Eichhorn p. 784.

cessive editions of this original Gospel, in which case different editions might have been used by each Synoptist. Against this theory Julicher urges the criticism that

> "the theory in reality only shifts the difficulties out of the clear domain of the Canonical Gospels into the darkness of a vanished literature over which the imagination alone holds sway, and whose early and complete disappearance would not be far short of a miracle."[16]

iii. A third theory is the Fragment Hypothesis[17] of Schleiermacher. Taking his cue from the word in Luke's introduction (Luke 1:1-4) he evolved the idea that the sources of the three Gospels were fragmentary documents. Thus the Gospels were alike in so far as their writers had used the same or similar fragments, and different when they are based upon different fragments.

This theory seems never to have found anything like general acceptance, probably for the reason that Julicher states:

> "The existence of these fragments is more than doubtful;

16. Julicher p. 346.

17. Schleiermacher "Ueber die Schriften des Lukas."

> in the earliest times such aids to memory would not have been required, and in the later men did not write down this or that particular saying, but made relatively complete collections of them. The verbal agreement between the Synoptics is altogether too far-reaching, each one of the Gospels too much of a whole, to warrant us in thinking that they were put together out of a shifting mass of original fragments."[18]

iv. The last of the four theories to be discussed is that of mutual dependence or borrowing on the part of the three Gospels. This, of course, goes back to Augustine,[19] but was revived by Evanson[20] and Griesbach.[21] Still later it was developed by members of the Tübingen school.

18. Jülicher p. 346-347.

19. See note 5.

20. See p. 6.

21. Quoted from Stanton, Pt. II, p. 31. He first indicated his view incidentally in 1783 in a praelection on "Sources whence the Evangelists drew the narratives of the Resurrection" and elaborated it in a dissertation published in 1790 the title of which is Commentatis qua Marci evangelium totum e Matthaei et Lucae commentariis decerptum esse monstratur.

The instability of the position in general is shown by the amount of disagreement as to the order of the gospels, which existed among the adherents of this theory, every possible order having been suggested by one or the other of them.

The Tübingen School had, of course, the celebrated Tendenz Theorie to guide them and so agreed in making Mark the latest of the three and a synthesis of the two extreme theological positions which they thought were represented in the First and Third Gospels respectively. Later members of the school abandoned the priority of Luke in respect to Mark, but continued to contend for the priority of Matthew.

3. Present status.

So much then for the types of theories that have in the past presented themselves as candidates for acceptance by N. T. scholars. It remains to inquire as to the present standing of these various theories and to ask whether anything like a consensus of opinion exists now among scholars with regard to this problem.

A. General agreements.

In the first place we may note that there appears to be quite a general tendency towards a synthesis of these various approaches to the problem; a tendency to recognize an element of truth in each which must be conserved, although no one of the theories may be sufficient in itself as a satisfactory solution of the problem.

Thus, for instance, while the Oral Tradition theory as such is very generally rejected, it is recognized that oral tradition did play an important part in the composition of the Gospels, since the material most certainly existed in that form for a considerable period of time before it was committed to writing. There remains only the question as to how early this process of committing it to writing began, and how much of written material intervened between these first attempts at writing and our Gospels. It is also true that with the writing of documents the oral tradition did not cease to exist and no doubt exerted an influence on the writers of our Gospels even when they were depending primarily on written documents.

Or again, it is felt that the

Urevangelium theory was at least correct in emphasizing a written source as opposed to an oral one.

Then, too, in certain sections of the matter peculiar to the First or Third Gospel it would seem that the author is in possession of a fragment of tradition, oral or written, probably the latter, which was not at the command of his fellow-Synoptists, e.g., The Birth Story and genealogy of Matthew.

Finally, it is a development from the mutual dependence theory which has resulted in one of the most generally accepted points in the N. T. criticism of the present. (See point iii. below)

In addition to this general synthetic tendency just discussed, there are some points in the Synoptic discussion which may be said to be fairly well established. So that while there remain many points with regard to which there is still a confusion of differing opinions, something at least has been accomplished. These points of general agreement may now be noted.

i. It is generally recognized that the Synoptic Gospels are, at least in part,

based upon written documents. The Oral Tradition theory is rejected as inadequate by the vast majority of N. T. scholars.

ii. The priority of Mark is now practically an established fact. It was suggested by Busching and Evanson as early as 1766 and 1792 respectively and more emphatically by Koppe and Starr in 1782 and 1786 but for a time the opposite view continued in the ascendency. The priority of Mark was however revived by Lachmann in 1835 and practically established by Weisse[22] in 1838 and was a significant contribution to N. T. criticism as it held the key to much that has followed.

A detailed statement of the arguments for this position are beyond the scope of this discussion but a few of the more general points may be noted here. (a) The impression made upon the reader by a certain freshness and directness in the style. (b) The fact that almost all of Mark is found in the other two and a theory of amplification seems much more reasonable than one of the abbreviation of the two others by Mark.

22. Weiss I.N.T. p. 204.

based upon written documents. The Oral Tradition theory is rejected as inadequate by the vast majority of N. T. scholars.

11. The priority of Mark is now practically an established fact. It was suggested by Bowdoing and Evanson as early as 1768 and 1783 respectively and more emphatically by Koppe and Storr in 1782 and 1786 but for a time the opposite view continued in the ascendency. The priority of Mark was however revived by Lachmann in 1835 and practically established by Weisse in 1838 and was a significant contribution to N. T. criticism as it held the key to much that has followed.

A detailed statement of the arguments for this position are beyond the scope of this discussion but a few of the more general points may be noted here. (a) The impression made upon the reader by a certain freshness and directness in the style. (b) The fact that almost all of Mark is found in the other two and a theory of amplification seems much more reasonable than one of the abbreviation of the two others by Mark.

12. Weiss I.N.T. p. 204.

(c) In many cases differences in material common to Mark and Luke, or to Mark and Matthew can be explained as corrections while the opposite proceeding would be difficult to account for.

iii. Closely connected with the above is the third of the generally accepted facts, namely that Mark was used as a primary source by both Matthew and Luke. The basis for this is, of course, the presence in both of a large amount of Marcan material, and the fact that both, in general, follow the Marcan order of events; they seem to use Mark as a frame-work into which each, in his own manner inserts additional material.[23]

iv. The last of these points is that Matthew and Luke possessed in addition a second common source. This is thought to be proven by a large body of material which they possess in common besides the Marcan matter, and in which the verbal agreement is as great if not greater than it is in what they have both taken from Mark. Because of the character of this material, so largely didactic in nature it is some-

23. A significant departure from this common view forms the basis of the main body of this discussion.

times referred to as the Logian source or the Logian document. It is also referred to by the more indefinite term of "Q" from the German word Quelle meaning source.

The third and fourth of these generally accepted positions, while they are arrived at by a process of internal criticism have the support of external evidence in the statements of Papias to the effect that "Mark being the interpreter of Peter, wrote carefully though not in order, as he remembered them, the things spoken or done by Christ", and "that Matthew wrote the Logia in the Hebrew language and each one interpreted these as he could";[24] that is if we identify, as some scholars do, the former with our canonical Mark and the latter as at least the basis of the hypothetical "Q" or the Logian document.

B. The Two-Source Theory.

Taken together these two, our third and fourth point of agreement, form the celebrated Two-Source Theory, said by Harnack to be no longer

24. Eusebius Bk. III. Ch. 39, p. 115.

times referred to as the *Logian* source or the *Logian* document. It is also referred to by the more indefinite term of "Q" from the German word *Quelle* meaning source.

The third and fourth of these generally accepted positions, while they are arrived at by a process of internal criticism have the support of external evidence in the statements of Papias to the effect that "Mark being the interpreter of Peter, wrote carefully though not in order, as he remembered them, the things spoken or done by Christ", and "that Matthew wrote the *Logia* in the Hebrew language and each one interpreted these as he could"[24]; that is if we identify, as some scholars do, the former with our canonical Mark and the latter as at least the basis of the hypothetical "Q" or the Logian document.

E. The Two-Source Theory.

Taken together these two, our third and fourth point of agreement, form the celebrated Two-Source Theory, said by Harnack to be no longer

24. Eusebius Bk. III. Ch. 39, p. 115.

an hypothesis.

In other words, the Two-Source Theory holds that there were two main sources for our First and Third Gospels and that these sources were (a) Canonical Mark or a document closely resembling it, and (b) a second written document consisting largely if not entirely of sayings and discourses, teachings of Jesus. It goes without saying, of course, that while so much may be said to be generally accepted, there are many questions which remain unanswered and for which different solutions would be offered by the various adherents of this theory in outline as sketched above. So that while it may be said to be held by practically all N. T. scholars it is held in somewhat varying forms. Many such related questions might be suggested, as e.g., to the scope of the "Q" document. Did it include narrative material or only λόγια in the narrower sense of the word? Was it used in the same form by Matthew and Luke? Which of these two has reproduced it more faithfully? To what extent can it be reconstructed from these two documents? Did Mark know or use "Q"? But these questions also lie beyond the scope of this work.

as hypothesis.

In other words, the Two-Source Theory holds that there were two main sources for our First and Third Gospels and that these sources were (a) Canonical Mark or a document closely resembling it, and (b) a second written document consisting largely if not entirely of sayings and discourses, teachings of Jesus. It goes without saying, of course, that while so much may be said to be generally accepted, there are many questions which remain unanswered and for which different solutions would be offered by the various adherents of this theory in outline as sketched above. So that while it may be said to be held by practically all S. T. scholars it is held in somewhat varying forms. Many such related questions might be suggested, as e.g., to the scope of the "Q" document. Did it include narrative material or only [illegible] in the narrower sense of the word? Was it used in the same form by Matthew and Luke? Which of these two has reproduced it more faithfully? To what extent can it be reconstructed from these two documents? Did Mark know or use "Q"? But these questions also lie beyond the scope of this work.

It remains only to point out that the significance of this theory, valuable as it is, lies in the help it gives in explaining the relationship between the Synoptic Gospels in so far as they possess material common to all three, or to at least two, and, in the case of the second source, with regard to material closely resembling that which the First and Third have in common in addition to Mark. It fails as an explanation for material peculiar to either of the two longer gospels, and for instances where what are apparently different accounts of the same event, differ to such an extent as to make the use of a common source seem unlikely. This limitation of the Two-Source Theory as applied to the Third Gospel will form the basis for the next division of this story.

II THE PROTO-LUKE THEORY.

1. Limitations of the Two-Source Theory as applied to the Third Gospel.

At this point it may be well to emphasize that to use the term "limitation" in connection with the Two-Source Theory does not by any means imply a negation or rejection of that theory. It is merely a recognition of its inadequacy, and of the fact that while it provides the best explanation we have for many of the phenomena in the Synoptic Gospels, it must be supplemented if we are to account satisfactorily for all of them. In this connection Taylor's criticism of Streeter would seem to be justifiable when he says that the latter goes too far in saying that the Two-document Hypothesis has "broken down".

> "The theory that Matthew and Luke used two principal written sources, Mark and the Sayings document, "Q"--remains the key to the intricacies of the problem. What Canon Streeter has been able to show is that we need additional keys, or--if the expression be preferred--a more perfected key, if we are to achieve great success."[25]

25. Jour. of Relig. April, 1928, p. 231.

We turn now to a consideration of the features of the Third Gospel for the explanation of which we require the "more perfected key". These are, of course, in general, the peculiar Lucan characteristics, cases in which the writer disagrees with the Marcan source and at the same time differs from Matthew to such an extent that the divergence from Mark cannot be explained on the grounds of the use of the source common to Matt. and Lk., i.e., "Q". These departures fall into three general classes; (a) Lucan omissions of Marcan material, (b) Lucan additions, (c) other variations from the Marcan Source.

A. Problems involved.

i. With regard to omissions.

In this first, the matter of omissions, Lk. differs considerably from Mt. in the amount which he omits from Mk. as well as in his method of doing it. Whereas Mt. reproduces "90% of the subject matter of Mark in language very largely identical with that of Mark, Luke does the same for only a little more than half of Mark."[26] According

26. Streeter F. G. p. 151.

to Streeter Mt. omits only 55 verses of Mark, and of these some at least are substitutions not omissions, since Mt. has their equivalents in other contexts. Then, too, these omissions consist of particular incidents, e.g., the healing of the demoniac, Mk. 1: 27-28, of a dumb man, 7:32-37, and of a blind man, 8:22-27, etc., scattered throughout the Gospel. In no case do we have the omission of a continuous block of material.

Very different, however, is the case with Luke, although the difference does not appear until we reach the sixth chapter of Mark's Gospel. In this first part it is true that we find four[27] sections which appear to be omissions but in reality prove to be cases of supersession by similar matter or postponements,[28] and three real omis-

27. Mk. 1:16-20
Mk. 6:1-6:1 -- Lk. 5:1-11 and 4:16-30
Mk. 3:22-30 and 4:30-32 -- Lk. 11:14-26 and 13: 18 ff.
Hawkins O.S.S.P. p. 61.

28. Mk. 3:20 ff, the desire of friends of Jesus to lay hold on him "for they said he is beside himself"
Mk. 4:26ff. Parable of the Growing Seed.
Mk. 4:14-29 details of the Baptist's death.

sions which may be explained without great difficulty. In the sixth chapter comes the decided change. Here Luke apparently deserts his Marcan source completely and omits 74 verses, or almost exactly one ninth part of the 661 genuine verses of our Second Gospel. This section, Mk. 6:45 - 8:26 is appropriately called Luke's Great Omission since as Hawkins points out[29] "it is not only great in compass, but it is complete and permanent; that is to say, there are no postponements or reservations of the omitted matter for use on other occasions, except only that the caution against the 'leaven of the Pharisees'(Mk. 8:15 -- Mt. 16:6) reappears on a later occasion and in quite a different connection in Luke 12:1 as a warning against hypocrisy." Such an omission is peculiar to Luke, differing from Matthew's omissions in extent and in consisting of a single block of diversified material.

ii. With regard to additions.

But the Third Gospel presents a problem, not only in the matter of omissions but also in that of its additions to the Marcan source,

29. O.S.S.P. p. 62.

additions in which there is found much material that is peculiar to Luke. Three major sections of the Third Gospel are included under this head, namely the Birth Stories (Lk. 1:5-2:52) and the Genealogy (Lk. 3:23-38) and two sections known as the Lesser Interpolation (Lk. 6:20-8:3) and the Great Interpolation (Lk. 9:51-18:14). With regard to the two last-mentioned, Hawkins has demonstrated apparently beyond dispute that Luke's disuse of his Marcan authority here was not only comparative but entire.[30]

There are other minor additions to, or variations from the Marcan source which can be readily explained as editorial comments or corrections of the Marcan text.

There is, however, another section in which Luke differs so widely from Mark that scholars have frequently argued[31] that here, too, he has deserted his Marcan source with the exception of a few Marcan insertions. I refer to the Passion and Resurrection narratives (Lk. 22-24.) But no such general agreement has been reached on this

30. Hawkins O.S.S.P. p. 31-53.

31. Burkitt, Perry, Taylor.

point as in regard to the two "interpolations", and in any case the desertion of the Marcan source here is not complete. So that this section cannot be classed as a third interpolation on a level with the other two. Yet in it there is sufficient divergence from both Mk. and Mt. to create a problem, and, as we shall see, this section has been considered of no little significance in connection with theories of Luke's supplementary sources.

In the case of numerous other sections, it is argued that Luke is following "Q". or a special source rather than Mark, but these views are better discussed in connection with theories in support of which they were advanced.

iii. As to other variations.

Besides the matter of omissions, and additions some general characteristics of Luke's method in the treatment of his source make the problem more complicated and may be noted here.

(a) He inserts material from his various sources in belts or strips, he does not interweave it as Matthew does.

(b) When he has more than one account of an event he selects the one he prefers.

He does not conflate the two as Matthew attempts to do.

(c) He does not show Matthew's tendency to group material topically.

(d) In general, he leaves an incident in the chronological order in which he finds it in his source, as shown by a study of his use of the Second Gospel. Thus if it is found in a different context in his Gospel this would seem to indicate that it has been taken from a different source.

(e) He does not create connections in time not found in his source.

(f) He follows Mark less closely than Matthew does, as we have seen in considering the matter of omissions and interpolations, particularly the former.

B. Attempted Solutions.

What then are the explanations which have been offered for these phenomena not accounted for by the Two-document hypothesis?

i. Of Omissions.

In attempting to answer this question, we will consider first the problem of omis-

sions. Four suggestions have been offered by which to account for the Great Omission:[32] (a) that the entire passage is a later insertion in the Second Gospel; (b) that it was accidentally omitted by Luke; (c) that the omission was intentional because of the character of the material found in it; (d) that Luke used a mutilated copy of Mark in which 6:47b - 8:27 was lacking.

(a) A later insertion.

The first of these assumes two forms; (a) that the insertion was made by a later writer; (b) that it was added later by the hand of Mark himself. The first is rendered most unlikely by Hawkin's convincing demonstration that linguistically there is no difference between this section and the remainder of the Second Gospel. This difficulty is avoided by assuming a common author for both, but another problem remains, one which Streeter has emphasized. This lies in the fact that if this section is an insertion it must have been added before the use of the document by Mt. since it was present in his copy. But both

32. Taylor B.T.G. p. 138.

copies lacked the ending of Mark. As Streeter points out, "it is very remarkable that any edition should have circulated which broke off short without giving any account of the Resurrection appearances, but that a second and greatly enlarged edition should have been published without an ending is quite incredible."[33]

Neither a mutilation theory nor one of omission by accident can be proven and the most likely explanation seems to be that for some reason or other Luke purposely omitted this section. This again may be considered from two standpoints, (a) Luke may have intentionally omitted this section because of some objection to each division of it, or, in the case of parts which he wished to use, he had a version which he preferred; or (b) his rejection may have been occasioned, not by a preference for a differing version of individual incidents, but for a source as a whole. Hawkins adopts the former[34] and believes he finds in each case a sufficient reason for its rejection. As a result

33. Streeter F.G. p. 74.

34. O.S.S.P. p. 67.

33. Streeter B.H. p. 74.

34. O.S.S.P. p. 87.

he decides upon a combination of the two hypotheses of accident and intention. The latter is the point of view adopted in the Proto-Luke theory which we are about to investigate.

ii. Of additions.

As for the additions of matter peculiar to Luke, these must of course be accounted for by some theory of the possession of additional source material by the author or a difference of purpose on his part. The latter has not been strongly emphasized because it cannot be shown that Luke's purpose differed so widely from that of the others that much of his peculiar material would not have been utilized by them if it had been at their disposal. It is true that some few minor differences are explained by the fact that Luke had Gentile readers in mind while Matthew was written primarily for Jews, or that Mark did not draw largely upon teachings because he was interested chiefly in writing a narrative work to supplement the collection of Sayings which he knew was already in circulation. But such conceptions, while they may contain an element of truth and carry some little weight are wholly inadequate to account for all of Luke's peculiar material. Particularly in

the case of Matthew, much that is found in Luke only, would surely have served his purpose admirably, and it is incredible that he should have neglected to incorporate it in his gospel if it had been in his possession.

We are, then, reduced to some theory of a special source or sources for Luke. There remain, however, the further questions as to whether this source were written or merely oral tradition, or written for some sections and oral for others, and, if his source material were entirely written in form, whether it consisted of one continuous source or of written "fragments" in terms of Schleiermacher.

Careful study of linguistic and literary characteristics of the special Lucan material as well as of its arrangement in the Third Gospel has resulted in a quite general agreement that Luke possessed a written source or sources in addition to Mark and "Q.", although opinions differ as to how extensively he drew upon oral sources also for the enrichment of his production.

No such agreement has been reached, however, as to the number of his sources.

Frequently a number of sources have been posited, but there have not been wanting those who have contended for one main source in addition to Mark and "Q". Among the latter belong those who have propounded the Proto-Luke Theory. Various theories belonging to one or other of these groups will be considered later in the light of their relation to the Proto-Luke theory and for that reason no discussion of them will be undertaken at this point.

iii. Of other variations.

The points characteristic of Luke's method dealing with source material will also come up for consideration in connection with theories of source. Therefore, no treatment of that, our third class of Lucan problems, is necessary here and we may pass now to a presentation of the Proto-Luke Theory itself.

2. The Theory of Proto-Luke.

A. A summary statement of the theory.

"The Proto-Luke hypothesis.....posits a continuous non-Marcan source, consisting mainly of "Q" matter and material peculiar to Luke, as the foundation and framework of the Third Gospel.....

This document, Proto-Luke, was the main source used in compiling the Gospel. Into it large extracts from Mark have been inserted, and the whole has been preceded by the Birth and Infancy narratives, and the preface to the Gospel (1:1-4)".[35] Such is a summary statement of the theory as given by one of its two main exponents. The details of the theory will appear in connection with a discussion of its development.

B. Streeter's Presentation.

This theory was first propounded by Burnett Hillman Streeter in an article in the Hibbert Journal for Oct. 1921, and more fully developed in his book The Four Gospels published in 1925.

i. Outline of the theory.

The successive steps in the development of Streeter's theory as outlined by himself[36] are as follows:

(a) He makes the position established by Hawkins his point of departure, namely that in the Great and Lesser Interpolations Luke is

35. Taylor B.T.G. p. 182.

36. Streeter F.G. p. 199.

entirely independent of Mark and that the section of Luke 19:1-27 is a third block of similar character. The material from these blocks is derived either from "Q" or from a source peculiar to Luke, which may be styled "L".

(b) In view of the fact as Streeter maintains that "Q" as well as Mark contained an account of John's preaching, the Baptism and Temptation, it becomes evident that the section Lk. 3:1-4:30 constitutes yet another example of Luke's disuse of Mark.

(c) "Again, Luke's account of the Resurrection Appearances is wholly, his account of the Passion mainly, derived from a non-Marcan source."

(d) "But if the Gospel began and ended with non-Marcan material, is not 'interpolation' the wrong word to use of the other non-Marcan passages mentioned above? The distribution of Marcan and non-Marcan sections suggests rather the hypothesis that the non-Marcan material formed the framework into which extracts from Mark were 'interpolated' by the editor of the Gospel."

(e) The hypothesis implies that

the editor of the Gospel found "Q", not in its original form, but embodied in a much larger document ("Q" + "L") which was in fact a complete Gospel, somewhat longer than Mark.

ii. Author of Proto-Luke.

Streeter suggests that the author of Proto-Luke--the one who combined "Q" and "L"--was Luke the companion of Paul. He emphasizes that this is a suggestion only, stating that while he considers "the existence of Proto-Luke a scientific hypothesis which is to a considerable extent capable of verification--the suggestion as to authorship is one which, from the nature of the case, does not admit either of verification or refutation to anything like the same extent."[37]

He supports his contention that the author of the Gospel, Acts and Proto-Luke was the same person on the grounds that a similar 'tendency' can be traced in all three. "The interest and point of view evinced in the selection of incidents, the emphasis laid on them and the general presentation of Christianity and its history is exactly

37. Streeter Op. cit. p. 218.

the same throughout."[38]

A number of such points of similarity are noted by Streeter.

(a) "The author of the 'we-sections' tells us that he stayed two years in Caesarea which had once been the capital of the Herod dynasty; a special knowledge of, and interest in, the Herods is found both in Proto-Luke and in the first part of Acts."

(b) He stayed in the house of Philip the evangelist of Samaria, and an interest in Samaria and Samaritans manifests itself in the first part of Acts and in Proto-Luke.

(c) The desire to represent Christ as the Savior of the world, accepted by Gentiles but rejected by his own people is evident in both Acts and Proto-Luke.

(d) The preference for the more rather than the less miraculous of the two versions of a story is characteristic of both.

(e) There is also throughout the Lucan writings an atmosphere of extraordinary

38. Streeter Op. cit. p. 219.

tenderness, somehow made quite compatible with the sternest call to righteousness, sacrifice and effort."

On the basis of such reasoning, Streeter concludes that the Luke who while with Paul wrote the "we-sections" or travel diary of Acts which he later embodied in a larger work, pursued the same course in regard to the Gospel. While in Caesarea he gathered material and made copious notes. "Later on, probably not till after the death of Paul, a copy of "Q" came his way and on the basis of this and his own notes he composed Proto-Luke as a Gospel for the use of the Church in the place where he was then living. Still later, a copy of Mark came his way and he then produced the second and enlarged edition of his Gospel which has come down to us." Streeter is willing to admit that the earlier edition, Proto-Luke, probably never passed into circulation.

iii. Historical importance of Proto-Luke Theory.

Streeter attaches considerable historical importance to his theory of Proto-Luke. Instead of two primary authorities for the Historical evidence of the life of Christ or in fact one, since

"Q" is mostly sayings, we now have a third, Proto-Luke. "It is true that Proto-Luke is of later date than "Q", but in all probability so is Mark. The essential thing is that Proto-Luke is independent of Mark. Where the two are parallel it would seem that Proto-Luke is sometimes inferior in historical value.. sometimes superior. Neither Mark nor Proto-Luke is infallible; but as historical authorities they should probably be regarded as on the whole of approximately equal value. But if so, this means that far more weight will have to be given by the historian of the future to the Third Gospel, and in particular to those portions of it which are peculiar to itself."[39]

With this may be contrasted the position of Burkitt who emphasizes the superior historical value of Mk. over Mt. and Luke and argues for the trustworthiness of the two last-mentioned chiefly on the basis of "the very considerable degree of faithfulness and historical intelligence which these two evangelists exhibit in essentials in their treatment of Marcan material."[40] All of

39. Streeter Op. cit. p. 222.

40. Burkitt, p. 116, E.S.

which illustrates the reversal of judgment which the adoption of the Proto-Luke Theory entails.

C. Vincent Taylor's Presentation.

Vincent Taylor has adopted Streeter's theory and in his book which he calls Behind the Third Gospel, a Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis he has presented a more detailed study of it, and developed many of its implications which were not worked out by Streeter himself.

i. Outline of his work.

His first chapter is a survey of recent Synoptic source criticism in relation to the Third Gospel and in it he seeks to set the Proto-Luke hypothesis in line with the development of that source criticism and to trace the historical connections of the hypothesis with preceding theories. In the next three chapters he examines minutely section by section, the Lucan Passion and Resurrection narratives, the material in Lk. 1-21:4 and the Lucan eschatalogical discourse to determine the amount of Marcan and non-Marcan material in each. Following these, two chapters are devoted to a study of Luke's use of his Marcan source and of

which illustrates the reversal of judgment which the adoption of the Proto-Luke Theory entails.

C. Vincent Taylor's Presentation.

Vincent Taylor has adopted Streeter's theory and in his book which he calls Behind the Third Gospel, a Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis he has presented a more detailed study of it, and developed many of its implications which were not worked out by Streeter himself.

1. Outline of his work.

His first chapter is a survey of recent Synoptic source criticism in relation to the Third Gospel and in it he seeks to set the Proto-Luke hypothesis in line with the development of that source criticism and to trace the historical connections of the hypothesis with preceding theories. In the next three chapters he examines minutely section by section, the Lucan Passion and Resurrection narratives, the material in Lk. 1-21:4 and the Lucan geographical discourse to determine the amount of Marcan and non-Marcan material in each. Following these, two chapters are devoted to a study of Luke's use of his Marcan source and of

"Q" respectively. The seventh is an affirmation of the ground for positing the continuity of a main non-Marcan source and the one which follows is a discussion of the Proto-Luke hypothesis proper. The last two deal with the historical value and theology of Proto-Luke.

ii. Conclusions reached.

As a result of this study he reaches some well-defined conclusions:

(a) "That with the exception of two narratives, the denial of Peter, and the Burial of Jesus by Joseph of Arimathea, together with a few passages that are best explained as Marcan insertions, the Lukan stories of the Passion and Resurrection belong to a source or sources independent of Mark";[41] that this is a continuous non-Marcan source, documentary rather than oral and probably to be connected with a larger non-Marcan source. This forms the first step of the cumulative argument which he builds in support of the Proto-Luke hypothesis.

(b) In the material of Luke 1-21:4 he finds much that must be assigned to a non-Marcan source, as will be noted below.

41. Taylor, B.T.G. p. 67-68.

(c) In the eschatological discourse "21:5-11 is a Markan section, but 21:12-19 and 21: 30-36 are non-Markan passages containing Markan insertions in 21:16b, 21a, 23a, 26b-27, 21:29-33."[42] There is, however, not sufficient evidence to permit of connecting these non-Marcan sections with other non-Marcan parts of Luke.

(d) Luke's use of his Marcan source resembles rather the use of a valued secondary source[43] than that of a foundation document.

(e) His use of "Q" indicates several points of interest.[44]

(1) In Luke an attempt is clearly manifest to impose on "Q" a narrative form.

(2) In the sections where "Q" is used, the "Q" matter usually forms the foundation of the structure.

(3) In Luke, "Q" is always used in connection with non-Markan material; it is never fused with material derived from Mark.

42. Taylor, Op. cit. p. 117.

43. Taylor, Op. cit. p. 134.

44. Taylor, Op. cit. p. 161-163.

(4) There is a broad similarity of plan and construction in the four main sections where "Q" material is used.

(5) The facts would be satisfactorily explained by the assumption that at least three stages lie behind the Third Gospel--(1) the "Q" document possibly to some extent already enlarged, (2) an expanded narrative version of "Q", (3) the Third Gospel as we have it now, furnished with material from Mark.

(6) That the non-Markan element in Luke, with the exception of the Birth and Infancy narratives, the Preface to the Third Gospel and the non-Markan elements in the eschatalogical discourse, was originally found in one written source.

iii. Arguments for the theory.

His presentation of the case for the Proto-Luke hypothesis is really a summary of the conclusion reached in the preceding chapters and his arguments as follows:

(a) The analogy presented by the phenomena of the Passion and Resurrection narratives.

(b) The manner in which Mark is

actually used.

(c) Luke's method of using "Q".

(d) The relation of the Markan sections to the (presumed) continuous non-Markan source.

(e) The explanation which the Proto-Luke theory offers for Lukan omissions.

(f) The additional phenomena within the Third Gospel which are best explained by the Proto-Luke theory.

(1) The opening verses of Luke III.

(2) The position of the Lukan genealogy.

(3) The order in which Mark is reproduced.

(4) The position given to the Sermon at Nazareth.

(5) The Great Interpolation.

(6) The position assigned to the story of the blind man at Jericho.

(7) The implications of St. Luke's preface.

(g) The agreement of the theory

with all that we know of the Evangelist's literary methods, and in particular with his use of the "we-sections" in Acts.

iv. Content of Proto-Luke.

According to Taylor, the continuous non-Markan source used in the composition of the Third Gospel includes Lk. 3:1-4:30, 5:1-11, 6:12-8:3, 9:51-18:14, 19:1-28, 19:37-44, 19:47-48, and 22:14-24 (less the Markan additions).[45] Except in minor details this agrees with the material assigned to Proto-Luke by Streeter.[46]

v. Author and date of Proto-Luke.

He agrees with Streeter in considering the Evangelist the author of Proto-Luke on the basis of style, similarity of characteristic ideas, literary connections, and because it meets the objection to the Proto-Luke theory that the latter reduces overmuch the Evangelist's part in the formulation of the Gospel.

As to date, he would place the writing of Proto-Luke in 60-65 A.D. some little time

45. Taylor, Op. cit. p. 180.

46. Streeter F.G. p. 222.

after the Evangelist had first collected material for it in Caesarea, probably in part from the daughters of Philip, from Philip himself and other eye-witnesses.

vi. The importance of the theory.

He agrees with Streeter in regard to the historical importance to be attached to the theory and discusses its theological significance.

A brief comparison of these two presentations of the theory as outlined above will show how closely they agree in the formulation of the theory, the arguments on which it is based, and in regard to such questions as the author of Proto-Luke, the time and place of its composition and the material to be assigned to it. The chief difference is that Vincent Taylor has presented a more intensive treatment of the theory.

Such then is the Proto-Luke theory in its main outlines as it stands at present in the field of New Testament scholarship.

3. Historical Background of the Theory.

A. Points of contact with other theories of Lucan sources.

We pass now to a consideration of the historical connections of this theory, the points of contact it may have with preceding theories of Lucan sources. Here we will consider first those which have posited more than one non-Marcan source for Luke but are in agreement with our theory at some particular points. Among these we include the theories of Burkitt, Hawkins, Burton, Perry, Parsons and Wickes.

i. Burkitt.

Burkitt held that "Q" contained a narrative of the Passion and was in effect a gospel and that this was the source employed by St. Luke for his Passion narrative. He contends for the independence and high historical value of Luke's Passion Narrative.[47] At this point of course he is in complete agreement with one of the fundamental points in the development of the Proto-Luke hypothesis. The difference is that he assumes "Q" is the independent source.

ii. Hawkins.

47. Burkitt, G.H.T. p. 130 and Jour. of Theol. Studies April, 1907.

We pass now to a consideration of the historical connections of this theory, the points of contact it may have with preceding theories of Lucan sources. Here we will consider first those which have posited more than one non-Matcan source for Luke but are in agreement with our theory at some particular points. Among these we include the theories of Burkitt, Hawkins, Burton, Perry, Parsons and Wilkes.

i. Burkitt.

Burkitt held that "Q" contained a narrative of the Passion and was in effect a gospel and that this was the source employed by Luke for his Passion narrative. He contends for the independence and high historical value of Luke's Passion Narrative.[47] At this point of course he is in complete agreement with one of the fundamental points in the development of the Proto-Luke hypothesis. The difference is that he assumes "Q" is the independent source.

ii. Hawkins.

47. Burkitt, C.Q.R. 7. 130 and Journ. of Theol. Studies April, 1907.

Hawkins suggests as an explanation for Luke's Great Interpolation that "Luke may have drawn up this travel document with some special purpose, before he knew of, or at least before he began to found a gospel upon the Marcan Grundschrift, and he may thus have had it ready to his hand for incorporation here."[48] He likewise suggests that at Caesarea or Jerusalem or elsewhere, a more exact and chronological account of this final journey had been supplied him by one who had at the time of the commencement of that journey become an eye-witness and minister of the word.[49] When these two suggestions are combined they will be seen to form a theory regarding the source of the Perean section which corresponds exactly with the way in which the Proto-Luke theory accounts for this particular section. The difference lies in the fact that such a Lucan document is not linked up with a larger whole as it is in the Proto-Luke theory, for Hawkins adheres firmly to the Two-document hypothesis.

48. O.S.S.P. p. 55.

49. O.S.S.P. p. 57.

iii. Burton.

In a sense, Burton is less closely connected with this development than the others for he posits a Galileȩan and Perean source for the material of Luke's Lesser and Great Interpolation respectively. His one point in common is the assumption of additional non-Marcan written sources for Luke's special material.[50]

Perry has made an interesting, albeit not very convincing attempt to find in the Proto-Luke theory support for Burton's theory of a Galileȩan source.[51]

iv. Perry.

Perry's point of contact is his maintenance of an independent source for Luke's Passion narrative.[52] This is a Jerusalem or J. document of early origin possibly composed by a writer who may have been a disciple of Jesus and an eye-witness of the events which he describes, and so the account would possess high historical value.

50. Burton, p. 156.

51. Jour. Bib. Lit. 47 (1928), 91-116.

52. Sources of Luke's Passion Narrative.

Here there is a close point of contact with Proto-Luke in the assumption of a non-Marcan source for the Lucan Passion narrative and in the estimation of it. There is wide divergence, however, in that Perry sharply distinguishes this "J" document from the other non-Marcan sources "G" and "P", thus affirming what he terms his Three-document hypothesis. His theory differs also as to the authorship of this source.

v. Wickes.

Wickes has worked out a theory of two sources for Luke's Perean section of which only one was used by Matthew.[53]

vi. Parsons.

Parsons by means of situational considerations has developed a theory of a Jerusalem source for the Perean section and two sources for the non-Marcan material of Luke 3-8, both of which have a Jerusalem origin. These last two theories have little in common with Proto-Luke except that they also are the product of a present day interest

53. Sources of Luke's Perean Section.

in the study of special Lucan sources.[54]

B. Theories of a continuous source.

More important, however, than any of these is a class of theories which agree with Proto-Luke in positing one main continuous, non-Marcan written source for Luke. Here are found the theories of Feine, B. Weiss, J. Weiss, Wendt, Weizsacker, Holdsworth, Stanton, Bartlett and Sanday.

i. Feine.

The earliest of these was that of Feine set forth in 1891 in his work Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas. He contended for a special documentary source other than Mark and "Q", Jewish Christian in character. This source began with Lk. 1:5 - 2: 52 and the genealogy of 3:23-38 and included the material peculiar to the Third Gospel apart from the Lucan parables. Before it was used by Luke, however, this document had been expanded by having the Logian matter common to Mt. and Luke embedied in it. He argues that the author was not Luke.

54. Parson's A Historical Examination of Some Non-Marcan Elements in Luke.

in the study of special Lucan sources.

B. Theories of a continuous source.

More important, however, than any of these is a class of theories which agree with Proto-Luke in positing one main continuous, non-Marcan written source for Luke. Here are found the theories of Feine, B. Weiss, J. Weiss, Wendt, Wellhausen, Holtzmann, Streeter, Bartlett and Bardy.

1. Feine.

The earliest of these was that of Feine set forth in 1891 in his work Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas. He contended for a special documentary source other than Mark and "Q", Jewish Christian in character. This source began with 1:5 - 2: 52 and the genealogy of 3:23-38 and included the material peculiar to the Third Gospel apart from the Lucan parables. Before it was used by Luke, however, this document had been expanded by having the Logian matter common to Mt. and Luke embedded in it. He argues that the author was not Luke.

84. Burton's A Historical Examination of Some Non-Marcan Elements in Luke.

Here we have agreement with Proto-Luke in the matter of a continuous written source consisting of a combination of peculiar Lucan narrative matter and Logia, "L" + "Q". But there is a difference in that it is thought to have included the Birth stories and Genealogy, and to have been formed by adding the Logian to the narrative matter instead of the reverse. It differs also with regard to the author of the source.

ii. B. Weiss.

B. Weiss first suggested his theory in his Life of Christ (1831) but it received its complete development in Die Quellen der synoptischen Überlieferungen, 1908.[55] His theory and that of J. Weiss were similar to that of Feine except for some minor differences in regard to the matter assigned to this source.

iii. Wendt and Weizsacker.

Wendt and Weizsacker arrived at a similar conclusion by a different method and held that the Logian document used by St. Luke had

55. Also in eighth edition of Meyer's Commentary Zweite Hälfte. Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas.

already come to include much of the matter peculiar to Luke in Lk. 6:20-8:3 and 9:51-18:14. At that point they are approaching the Proto-Luke theory.

iv. Holdsworth.[56]

Holdsworth posits a special source in addition to Mark and "Q" for the Infancy, Perean and Passion narratives.

The most interesting comparison, however, is with the work of two men working simultaneously and whose works were published about the time Streeter first set forth his Proto-Luke theory. These men are Stanton and Bartlett.

v. Stanton.[57]

According to Stanton the Birth Stories and the Genealogy come from a separate source. For the rest of the non-Marcan material, Luke uses a single written source, an expanded Logian document whose author was not Luke. Here it would seem that with the exception of the question of authorship,

56. Holdsworth, p. 170 ff.

57. Stanton G.H.D.

there is almost complete agreement with Streeter. There is, however, one point which will be noted later, at which Streeter departs from all predecessors including Stanton.

vi. Bartlett.[58]

Bartlett also believes that Luke followed a written source peculiar to himself. In addition to the use of some terms which Bartlett employs in a rather unusual sense, his main point of disagreement with Stanton is that he believes "Q" was first given written form in the special Lucan source which he terms "S". This source was Judeo-Christian in character and to it he attaches high historical significance, particularly in the Passion narrative.

As to the form in which it came to Luke, it was either written for Luke in response to inquiry or by him from the lips of informants. He obtained it while in Caesarea and it is the product of a single Judeo-Christian mind.

The similarity between such a theory and that of Proto-Luke is evident at a glance

58. O.S.S.P. p. 315-362.

there is almost complete agreement with Streeter.
There is, however, one point which will be noted
later, at which Streeter departs from all predeces-
sors including Stanton.

58

VI. Bartlett.

Bartlett also believes that Luke
followed a written source peculiar to himself. In
addition to the use of some terms which Bartlett
employs in a rather unusual sense, his main point
of disagreement with Stanton is that he believes "Q"
was first given written form in the special Lucan
source which he terms "L". This source was Hebra-
Christian in character and to it he attributes high
historical significance, particularly in the Passion
narrative.

As to the form in which it came
to Luke, it was either written for Luke in response
to inquiry or by him from the lips of informants.
He obtained it while in Caesarea and it is the pro-
duct of a single Judeo-Christian mind.

The similarity between such a
theory and that of Proto-Luke is evident at a glance

58. J.B.L.P. p. 315-323.

and does not require to be indicated point by point.

vii. Sanday.[59]

Sanday would agree to a special Lucan source but objects to the inclusion of "Q" material in it.

4. The Unique Features of the Theory.

In the above comparison of theories, we have emphasized in each case the points which the particular theory has in common with the Proto-Luke theory. A brief survey of results will indicate how closely the latter is related to the work of other scholars in this field. It is clear indeed that Proto-Luke is but the culmination of a general trend in the source criticism of Luke. But now it is necessary to indicate the unique features of Canon Streeter's theory, points at which he differs from the theories of predecessors however much of similarity there may be. These unique features are two in number.

A. Authorship of the source.

The first is in the matter of authorship

59. Sanday, O.S.S.P.

of the continuous non-Marcan source. Streeter is the first to have contended strongly for Lucan authorship, while some e. g. Feine, have definitely opposed such a conception. It is true that Streeter presents this point in the form of a suggestion which he considers less capable of scientific demonstration than the main points of his theory, but as we have seen, he does advance a number of reasons for holding it. In the presentation of Vincent Taylor it is given even stronger support. It may thus fairly be stated as one of the conceptions organic to the theory as a whole.

B. A non-Marcan framework for the Gospel.

The second and more important is the fact that according to this theory Proto-Luke and not Mark was the framework of the Third Gospel. This is the great new departure, the conception which had never been suggested by any previous scholar. It is this which brings about an entirely new approach to the problems of the Lucan phenomena and is particularly significant for the problem of omissions. It is also exceedingly important in regard to the implications of the theory for the evaluation of the

historical importance of this material. It is along this line that Canon Streeter's great contribution is made.

5. An Evaluation of the Theory.

A. The theory in contemporary criticism.

In an attempt to evaluate this theory of Proto-Luke it may be well to consider the opposition it has met and the recognition it has received in the field of New Testament criticism.

i. Opposition.

Opposition may be directly or indirectly expressed. In the latter case it consists of the exposition of a diametrically opposite position and not in direct attacks upon the theory itself. Such opposition is found in the work of Perry and Loisy.

(a) Perry.[60]

Perry, as has been shown, opposes one main position in the Proto-Luke theory when he argues determinedly for the distinction of

60. Perry, The Sources of Luke's Passion Narrative.

the source of the Passion narrative from that of other non-Marcan sections. His arguments on the whole fail to carry conviction, the differences which he stresses seeming often to be no more than are inherent in the different character of the subject matter, e.g., the difference in the interest shown in, and references to, the death of Jesus in this "J" document and in "G" and "P". Such reasoning does not, in the opinion of the present writer, greatly incriminate Canon Streeter's much stronger contention for the unity of an underlying source.

(b) Loisy.

Loisy's theory[61] which attributes most of the material peculiar to Luke to a later redactor is, of course, a position differing widely from that of Canon Streeter but it is doubtful if it can be maintained. The criticism which Taylor levels at it in the Hibbert Journal[62] would seem to be almost conclusive. (1) The fact that the simple Christology found in the Third Gospel is irreconcilable with the late date of its re-

61. Loisy, L'Evangile selon Luc.

62. Taylor Hib. Jour. 24(1925-26) 562-572.

daction. (2) Its inner inconsistency. Loisy finds in the earlier strata the very tendencies which he has used to distinguish the later, thus cutting the ground from under his own contention.[63]

(c) Montefiori.

Here we come to those who have referred directly to Canon Streeter's theory. Montefiori objects to it on the ground that Streeter's position is over-conservative but does not criticise the theory in detail.

(d) Easton.

Easton thinks that Streeter's arguments for a combination of "Q" and "L" before the material was incorporated in the Third Gospel, are inconclusive. He says "All that Dr. Streeter has--most correctly--noted could be just as true if Luke studied his three sources carefully, laid them down side by side and then proceeded to build up his Gospel from all three simultaneously.[64] Again in his commentary he says:

"The results of the present commentary indicate

63. Montefiori XCVI.

64. Easton Anglican Theol. Review. 8(1925-26), 256-263.

> that it is simplest to treat "L" and "Q" as separate documents in Luke's hands. But certainty on such a point is not obtainable: Luke and Matthew appear to have used the same text of Mark, but a document such as "Q" might be more susceptible of modification." [65]

(e) Hunkins.

Hunkins has written a detailed criticism of the Proto-Luke theory.[66] He is willing to accept Streeter's theory of a previous combination of "Q" and "L", with some modifications, but he objects to the idea that Luke used Mark as a supplementary source only. His objections are answered satisfactorily by Taylor.[67]

(f) Stephenson.[68]

Stephenson writing of Streeter's theory, as it was set forth in 1921, is also willing to agree with the latter in regard to

65. Easton Commentary.

66. Jour. of Theol. Studies. 28(1926-27) 250-262.

67. Jour. of Relig. April, 1928, p. 225-246.

68. Stephenson Jour. Theol. Studies 23(1921-22), 250-255.

the combination of "Q" and "L", but like Hunkins, he hesitates to consider such a document the framework of the Third Gospel. He adds that this is perhaps unimportant and endorses Streeter's high estimate of the importance of the special Lucan material.

ii. Favorable recognition.

We turn now to the supporters of the theory. The fact that Vincent Taylor has accepted the theory and developed it, has already been considered. He claims that

> "general agreement with the Proto-Luke hypothesis has been expressed by F.C. Burkitt, A.S. Peake, A. H. McNeile, H.G. Wood, J.V. Bartlett, W. Clark, H.F. Andrew, W.J.Howard, and G.S. Duncan."[69]

E.F. Scott has said that

> "Dr. Streeter works out his hypothesis with remarkable skill, and though some of his arguments are precarious, we cannot but feel that he has made a real discovery."[70]

69. Jour. of Relig. April 1928, p. 238.

70. Yale Review. 15 (1925-26) 609-610.

the combination of "Q" and "L", but like Hunkins, he hesitates to consider such a document the framework of the Third Gospel. He adds that this is perhaps unimportant and endorses Streeter's high estimate of the importance of the special Lucan material.

ii. Favorable recognition.

We turn now to the supporters of the theory. The fact that Vincent Taylor has accepted the theory and developed it, has already been considered. He claims that

> "general agreement with the Proto-Luke hypothesis has been expressed by F.C. Burkitt, A.S. Peake, A. H. McNeile, B.C. Wood, J.V. Bartlett, W. Clark, R.F. Andrew, W.J.Howard, and G.S. Duncan."[69]

E.F. Scott has said that

> "Dr. Streeter works out his hypothesis with remarkable skill, and though some of his arguments are precarious, we cannot but feel that he has made a real discovery."[70]

69. Jour. of Relig. April 1938, p. 238.

70. Yale Review. 15 (1925-26) 609-610.

B. Concluding Estimate of the Theory.

To the present writer it appears that the strength of the theory lies in its comprehensiveness. It explains the phenomena accounted for by the other theories, whether of separate or continuous sources, and also for the phenomena which these other theories have left unexplained. It possesses all their merit without being open to the criticism to which one or the other of them is exposed.

Thus while it cannot be said to be an established principle of New Testament criticism it is nevertheless of sufficient importance to form the basis of this investigation. The purpose is not to defend the theory of Proto-Luke but, assuming the existence of such a document, to inquire as to its significance for other New Testament writings. A beginning has been made along this line by Vincent Taylor, but it is believed that in regard to the Fourth Gospel it can be carried farther. Such an attempt will form the substance of the following sections.

6. The Proto-Luke Document.

A. Content.

E. Concluding Estimate of the Theory.

To the present writer it appears that the strength of the theory lies in its comprehensiveness. It explains the phenomena accounted for by the other theories, whether of separate or continuous sources, and also for the phenomena which these other theories have left unexplained. It possesses all their merits without being open to the criticisms to which one or the other of them is exposed.

Thus while it cannot be said to be an established principle of New Testament criticism it is nevertheless of sufficient importance to form the basis of this investigation. The purpose is not to defend the theory of Proto-Luke but, assuming the existence of such a document, to inquire as to its significance for other New Testament writings. A beginning has been made along this line by Vincent Taylor, but it is believed that in regard to the Fourth Gospel it can be carried farther. Such an attempt will form the substance of the following sections.

6. The Proto-Luke Document.

A. Content.

Before passing to that phase of the investigation, however, it will be necessary to point out definitely the subject matter of Proto-Luke and to note its more important points of contrast with other lines of tradition in the Synoptic Gospels. For this purpose the topical arrangement adopted below was evidently the most suitable.[71] As has been stated above[72] the material assigned to Proto-Luke includes Lk. 3:1 - 4:30, 5:1-11, 6:12 - 8:3, 9:51 - 18:14, 19:1-28, 19:37-44, 19:47-48, and 22:14 - 24 (less the Marcan insertions). In these sections are found the following discussions.

3:1-20 The Ministry of the Baptist.

3:21-22 The Baptism of Jesus.

3:23-28 The Genealogy.

4:1-13 The Temptation.

4:14-15 The Departure into Galilee.

4:16-30 The Rejection at Nazareth.

5:1-11 The Call of the Four.

71. The topics used are taken from Burton and Goodspeed--A Harmony of the Synoptic Gospels in Greek.
Sections which have parallels or possible parallels in Mt. or Mk. are underscored in red or green according as the parallel is found in the first or second Gospel.

72. p. 36.

6:12-19	The Choosing of the Twelve.
6:20-26	The Character and Duties of Disciples.
6:27-36	The Righteousness of the Kingdom and the Teaching of the Synagogue.
6:37-42	On Judging.
6:43-49	On Doing Righteousness.
7:1-10	The Centurion's Servant.
7:11-17	The Raising of the Widow's Son.
7:18-35	The Message from John the Baptist.
7:36-50	The Anointing of Jesus.
8:1-3	A Preaching Tour, Women Accompanying.
9:51-56	The Departure from Galilee.
9:57-62	Answers to Three Disciples.
10:1-16	Mission of the Seventy.
10:17-24	The Return of the Seventy.
10:25-37	The Good Samaritan.
10:38-42	Visit to Martha and Mary.
11:1-13	Concerning Prayer.
11:14-28	On Casting out Demons by Beelzebub.
11:29-32	The Sign of Jonah.
11:33-36	The Inner Light.
11:37-44	The Rebuke of the Pharisees.
11:45-54	The Rebuke of the Scribes.
12:1-12	Concerning Fearing and Trusting God.

12:13-21	The Rich Fool.
12:22-34	Concerning God's Care.
12:35-40	Concerning Watchfulness.
12:41-48	The Faithful Steward.
12:49-53	Concerning Fire and Division.
12:54-59	Interpreting the Times.
13:1-9	The Galileans Slain By Pilate.
13:10-17	The Woman Healed on a Sabbath.
13:18-21	Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven.
13:22-30	The Question whether Few are Saved.
13:31-35	Reply to the Warning Against Herod.
14:1-24	Discourse at the Table of a Chief Pharisee.
14:25-35	Discourse on Counting the Cost.
15:1-7	The Lost Sheep.
15:8-10	The Lost Coin.
15:11-32	The Lost Son.
16:1-13	The Unjust Steward.
16:14-18	Concerning the Law and the Kingdom.
16:19-31	The Rich Man and Lazarus.
17:1-10	Concerning Forgiveness.
17:11-19	The Ten Lepers.
17:20 - 18:8	The Coming of the Kingdom.

18:9-14	The Pharisee and the Publican.
19:1-10	Zacchaeus the Publican.
19:11-28	Parable of the Minae.
19:37-44	The Triumphal Entry.
19:47-48	Reference to Teaching in the Temple.
22:14-38	The Last Supper. (Except v. 19,22,34).
22:39-46	The Agony in Gethsemane.
22:47-53	The Betrayal and Arrest. (Except v. 52-53^{b}).
22:54-71	Trial Before the Jewish Authorities. (Except v. 54^{b} - 62).
23:1-25	The Trial Before Pilate. (Except v. 3).
23:26-49	The Crucifixion of Jesus. (Except v. 26,34^{b},38,44-46).
23:50-56	The Burial of Jesus. (Except v. 50-53).
24:1-12	The Resurrection Morning. (Except v. 10).
24:13-35	The Walk to Emmaus.
24:36-49	The Appearance to the Eleven in Jerusalem, and the Commission of the Disciples.
24:50-53	The Ascension.

B. Points of Contrast with Mk. - Mt.

Having now the subject matter of Proto-Luke before us, our next task is to note the points

at which it differs from the Mk. - Mt. tradition. The sections which have no parallel in the other two Gospels may, of course, be passed without comment. Since they present material not found elsewhere they are, of course, peculiar to Proto-Luke and in them the unique features of this document may be most clearly seen. These unique features are not, however, confined to these sections, but stand out significantly in sections which have parallels or partial parallels in Mt. or Mk. or in both. Such sections we will now consider separately.

The Ministry of the Baptist is paralleled in Mt. 3:1-12 and Mk. 1:1-8. Proto-Luke differs in five main points.

i. In the historical references found in verses 1-2.

ii. Proto-Luke says, "John came into all the region round about Jordan." (V.3.) Mt. and Mk. say, "There went out unto him all the country of Judea and all they of Jerusalem." (Mt. 3:5, Mk. 1:5.)

iii. Proto-Luke states that the word of God came unto John. (v. 3.)

iv. In the specific demands made upon definite classes of people. (v. 10-14.)

v. The reference to the questioning on the part of the people as to whether or not John were the Messiah.

The Baptism of Jesus -- Mt. 3:13-17, Mk. 1:9-11.

i. Proto-Luke does not say that Jesus came from Galilee.

ii. Proto-Luke agrees with the Marcan account against Mt. in omitting any reference to John's reluctance to baptize Jesus.

iii. Proto-Luke says the experience came to Jesus as he was praying. (v. 21.)

iv. Proto-Luke says the Holy Spirit descended in a bodily form.

v. Proto-Luke agrees with the Marcan account against Mt. in putting the message of the voice in the second person rather than the third.

The Temptation -- Mt. 4:1-11, Mk. 1: 12,13.

i. Proto-Luke says Jesus was "full of the Holy Spirit." (v. 1.)

ii. Proto-Luke agrees with Mt. against

Mk. in giving an account of three specific temptations, but differs from Mt. in the order in which they are given.

iii. Proto-Luke says the devil departed from him for a season, but says nothing of the ministering angels referred to in Mt. and Mk.

The Departure into Galilee -- Mt. 4 : 12-17, Mk. 1:14,15.

i. Proto-Luke does not connect this return with the arrest of John the Baptist as do Mt. and Luke.

ii. Proto-Luke says, "Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit."

The Rejection at Nazareth.

This incident itself has no parallel in Mt. or Mk. The only point of contact is that Mt. and Mk. do later (Mt. 13:53-58, Mk. 6:1-5) recount words by the fellow-countrymen of Jesus that are similar to those spoken by his fellow-townsmen in this section.

The Call of the Four -- Mt. 4:18-22, Mk. 1:16-20.

Taylor[73] decides that "it is a very

73. B.T.G. p. 232.

unsatisfactory type of exposition which explains these narratives as the accounts of separate incidents; they have too much in common and neither follows naturally after the other." In a footnote he points out that "each is a story of the call of the fishermen, Peter, and James and John, the sons of Zebedee. Both agree that Jesus addressed a remark about catching men, though they report it differently, and that the men followed Jesus."

The details of the story are all peculiar to Luke. The others do not mention that Jesus entered the boat, the miraculous draught of fishes, nor the cry of Simon, "Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord."

The Choosing of the Twelve -- Mt. 10:2-4, Mk. 3:13-19a.

i. Proto-Luke mentions the fact that Jesus spent the night in prayer.

ii. In the lists of the twelve the most significant difference is the substitution in the Lucan account of Judas, the son of James for the Thaddaeus of Mt. and Mk.

The Character and Duties of Disciples. This is paralleled in Mt. 5:1-16.

i. In Proto-Luke it is "poor", not "poor in spirit." v. 20.

ii. In Proto-Luke it is "those who hunger and weep now" that are declared blessed, not "those who hunger and thirst after righteousness." (v. 21.)

iii. Proto-Luke has "hate you and separate you from their company and reproach you, and cast out your name as evil for the Son of man's sake" (v.22) in contrast with Matthew's "reproach you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake."

iv. Proto-Luke says "Rejoice in that day and leap"; Mt. "Rejoice and be exceeding glad."

v. The woes of v. 24-26 are peculiar to Luke.

In the next three sectons (Lk. 6: 27-49) the differences are largely variations from Mt. in phraseology only.

The Centurion's Servant -- Mt. 8:5-13.

i. In Proto-Luke the servant is said to be "nigh unto death"; in Mt. he is "sick of the palsey, grievously tormented."

ii. According to Proto-Luke the Centurion sends elders of the Jews who say he is worthy etc.; according to Mt. he comes himself.

iii. In Proto-Luke he sends a second deputation with the message of his unworthiness; in Mt. he makes the speech himself.

The Message of John the Baptist -- Mt. 11:2-30.

i. v. 29-30 are peculiar to Luke.

ii. Proto-Luke omits Matthew's reference to violence and to Elijah.

The Anointing of Jesus.

The section has a possible parallel in Mt. 21:6-13, Mk. 14:3-9, but the Lucan peculiarities are numerous.

i. Difference in time and circumstances.

ii. The Pharisee is not said to be a leper in the Lucan account, nor is Bethany mentioned.

iii. The feet of Jesus are anointed, not his head.

iv. The woman is said to be a sinner.

v. The murmuring comes from Simon, not from the disciples of Jesus, and the content of Jesus's reply is entirely different.

The Answers to Three Disciples -- Mt. 8:19-22.

i. v. 60-62 are peculiar to Luke.

In the Mission of the Seventy certain of the instructions given them are paralleled in the accounts of the sending out of the Twelve in Mt. 9:37-38, 10:7-16a, and Mk. 6:8-11. Likewise in the account of the return, the words of Lk. 10: 21-22 -- Mt. 11:25-27 and Lk. 10:23-24 -- Mt. 13: 16-17, but the Mission of the Seventy is peculiar to Proto-Luke.

Concerning Prayer -- Mt. 6:9-13. Peculiar Lucan features are:

i. The request to be taught a prayer. 11:1.

ii. Five petitions instead of the seven of Mt.

iii. The parable of 11:5-7.

iv. "Holy Spirit" is substituted for the "good things" of Mt.

Casting out Demons by Beelzebub -- Mt.

12:22-24, 9:32-34, Mk. 3:22-27.

i. The voice of the woman in v. 27-28 is peculiar to Proto-Luke.

The Sign of Jonah -- Mt. 12:39-42.

i. Proto-Luke makes no reference to Jonah in the fish.

ii. v. 31 is inserted between two references to Nineveh.

The Rebuke of the Pharisees.

i. Proto-Luke mentions an invitation to a Pharisee's house.

Rebuke to the Scribes -- Mt. 23:~~43~~, 29-31.

i. In Proto-Luke the rebuke is addressed to lawyers.

Concerning Fearing and Trusting God - Mt. 16:6, 10:26b-33, Mk. 8:15, 3:28-9, Mk. 13:11.

i. Proto-Luke says, "the Holy Spirit shall teach you in that hour" etc., Mt. -- "It shall be given you in that hour" etc. for it is the Holy Spirit speaking in you."

Concerning God's Care -- Mt. 6:25-33,8:19-21.

i. v. 32. "Fear not little flock"

etc., is peculiar to Luke.

The Faithful Steward -- Mt. 24:45-51.

i. v. 47-48 peculiar to Luke.

The Question whether Few are Saved -- Mt. 7:13-14,22-23, 25:11b,12, 8:11,12.

i. Proto-Luke gives the situation and the question which called forth the discussion.

ii. Proto-Luke substitutes "We have eaten and drunken before thee and thou has taught in our streets" for "In thy name have we prophesied" etc.

iii. v. 29 is in the second person in Luke, in the third in Mt.

Discourse on Counting the Cost.

i. v. 26-27 -- Mt. 10:37,38 except that Proto-Luke gives the more striking form, i.e. hating father and mother.

ii. v. 28-33 peculiar to Luke.

The Lost Sheep -- Mt. 18:12-14.

i. The setting of v. 1-3 peculiar to Luke.

ii. Proto-Luke speaks of a gathering for rejoicing and says there is rejoicing in heaven etc. Mt. says "It is not the will of my Father in heaven etc."

Concerning the Law and the Kingdom.

i. v. 16 -- Mt. 11:13,12.

In Proto-Luke "The law and the prophets are until John", Mt. the law and prophets fulfilled in John.

ii. Proto-Luke "Press into the Kingdom." Mt. "take it by force." v. 17 -- Mt. 5:18.

iii. Proto-Luke "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass " etc., Mt. "Till heaven and earth pass." v. 18 -- Mt. 5:32.

iv. Proto-Luke omits Matthew's phrase "except for the cause of fornication."

Parable of Minae.

The only similar suggestion in Mk. 13:34 is the mere reference to a man going and committing authority to his servants.

In Mt. 25: 14-30 there is a possible parallel in the Parable of the Talents, but there are numerous differences.

i. Mt. does not say that the master was to receive a kingdom, or that his servants rebelled against his rule.

ii. Proto-Luke makes the amount each received equal and says they were to rule over

ten cities.

The Triumphal Entry -- Mt. 21:1-11, Mk. 11:1-11.

Here Mt. follows Mk. closely, but Proto-Luke departs from them at several points, and is at variance even with canonical Luke for in the latter the Marcan story of the colt is incorporated and so it is brought somewhat into harmony with the other two. In Proto-Luke the account is so much simpler that Taylor[74] says it is more accurately described as the Approach to Jerusalem. He notes specific differences as well.[75]

i. St. Luke associates the incident with a definite locality.

ii. He ascribes the rejoicing to the whole multitude of the disciples.

iii. In the words used there are material differences.

iv. The words of the Pharisee who said, "Master, rebuke thy disciples", and Jesus's reply, are peculiar to Luke.

74. ibid p. 236.

75. ibid p. 95.

The Reference to Teaching in the Temple -- Mt. 21:14-15, Mk. 11:18.

i. Luke uses his peculiar statement that he was teaching in the Temple to introduce the priests' plot.

ii. The nature of the priests' dilemma is differently expressed. In Proto-Luke the difficulty is to find a way of destroying him because all the people hung on him listening. In the other two Gospels they wish to destroy him because of this attitude of the people.

The Last Supper -- Mt. 26:17-35, Mk. 14:12-31.

i. Here Proto-Luke departs again not only from Mt. and ~~Luke~~ Mk., but from canonical Luke since it does not, according to Taylor's reconstruction, identify it with the Passover meal.[76]

ii. Proto-Luke also differs from these in the comparatively slight treatment given the institution of the Supper.

iii. Proto-Luke places the prediction of the betrayal after the account of the institution of the Supper, not before as in Mt. and Mk.

76. ibid p. 37.

iv. The discussion on true greatness is placed in connection with the Supper instead of in another connection as with Mt. and Mk.

v. The prediction of the denial is placed in Proto-Luke at the Supper, not after as with Mt. and Mk.

vi. There are also differences in connection with the prediction itself.

(a) Proto-Luke has no parallel to the saying about smiting the sheep, to the prophecy of Christ's appearance in Galilee, to Peter's words "though all should be offended in thee" etc., or the "in like manner also said they all."

(b) There is a slight difference between "Lord with thee I am ready to go to prison and to death" of Proto-Luke, and "If I must die with thee I will not deny thee" in Mt. and Mk.

vii. The conversation on change of methods (Lk. 22:35-38) is peculiar to Proto-Luke.

The Agony in the Garden -- Mt. 26: 36-46, Mk. 14:32-42.

Here again Mt. follows Mk. closely

while Proto-Luke differs at many points.[77]

i. In the latter no reference to the name Gethsemane.

ii. No reference to the separation of Peter, James, and John from the rest.

iii. Proto-Luke does not speak of Jesus being "greatly amazed" and sore troubled, nor does it give the saying "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death."

iv. In Proto-Luke Jesus is parted from his disciples by a stone's cast; in the other two Gospels he first separates the three from the rest and then goes forward a little.

v. In Proto-Luke he kneels, in the other two he falls to the ground.

vi. Apart from the words "remove this cup from me", the two versions of Christ's prayer vary widely in phraseology.

vii. In Proto-Luke Jesus addresses all the disciples, in the other two Peter and then the rest.

viii. To the remainder of the Mt. -

77. ibid p. 44.

Mk. story Proto-Luke has no parallel -- to the reproach to Peter; the saying "the spirit indeed is willing but the flesh is weak"; the threefold prayer and the threefold discovery of the disciples sleeping; the saying "it is enough; the hour is come"; the words about the approach of the traitor.

The Betrayal and Arrest -- Mt. 26: 47-56, Mk. 14:43-52.

Here again Proto-Luke departs from the other two.[78]

i. In the latter the multitude is mentioned first.

ii. There is no reference to "swords and staves", norto the statement that the crowd came "from the chief priests and the scribes and the elders."

iii. Proto-Luke tells us nothing of the sign arranged by Judas, nor does he tell us that Judas actually kissed Jesus, though the latter is probably implied in the words, peculiar to Luke in verse 48 -- "Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss?"

78. ibid p. 45.

iv. There are striking differences in the incident connected with the servant of the high priest.

The Trial Before the Jewish Authorities -- Mt. 26:57-75, Mk. 14:53-72.

i. The Proto-Luke account is much less objective than the account of the other two.

ii. The phrase "power" is defined in Proto-Luke as "the power of God."

iii. In Proto-Luke the question "what further need have we of witness?" is asked by all whereas in Mt. and Mk. the similar question is put by the high priest only. There is no special reference, as in the others, to blasphemy.

iv. The most important difference here is the difference in respect of time. Proto-Luke describes a trial by day, the others place it in the night.

v. There are also differences in regard to the Mocking.

(a) In Proto-Luke the Mocking precedes the trial and those who mock Jesus are "the men who held him" presumably those who made the

arrest.

In the Mt. - Mk. accounts the story of the Mocking is closely connected with that of the trial, and the men who insult Jesus are present in the court and are expressly distinguished from the "officers".

(b) Proto-Luke has no reference to spitting and speaks of beating rather than buffetting.

(c) The closing sentence "and many other things spake they against him reviling him." is peculiar to Luke.

The Trial Before Pilate -- Mt. 27:1-31, Mk. 15:1-20.

i. In the Mt. - Mk. account it is the crowd which approaches Pilate and reminds him of the custom of the feast, and it is the crowd which, under the instigation of the chief priests, cries out for the release of Barabbas. In Proto-Luke we learn nothing of this distinction.

ii. The most obvious contrast between Proto-Luke and the other **narratives** is in the portraiture of Pilate. The threefold declaration of the innocence of Jesus is peculiar

to Proto-Luke.

iii. The account of the trial before Herod is likewise peculiar to Proto-Luke.

The Crucifixion -- Mt. 27:32-56, Mk. 15:21-24.

i. The Proto-Luke account omits the following features that are found in the others.

(a) The name "Golgotha."

(b) The statement that wine was offered to and rejected by Jesus.

(c) The statement regarding the time of the Crucifixion.

(d) The reference to the railing of those who passed by, who wagged their heads and said, "Ha! thou that destroyest the temple and buildest it in three days, save thyself, and come down from the cross."

(e) The statement that those who were crucified with him (i.e. both) reproached him.

(f) The cry of Jesus "Eloi, Eloi, lama Sabachthani."

(g) The statement that the bystanders supposed that Jesus called for Elijah.

ii. There are also features peculiar to Proto-Luke.

(a) The word malefactors κακοῦργοι (v. 32-33.)

(b) If it is not an interpolation in Luke, the prayer "Father forgive them: for they know not what they do." (v. 34.)

(c) The words "and the people stood beholding." (v. 35.)

(d) The phrase "his chosen" used of Christ by the rulers. (v. 35.)

(e) The statement that the soldiers mocked Jesus offering him vinegar and crying "If thou art the King of the Jews save thyself." (v. 36.)

(f) The story of the penitent thief, including the words of his companion, "Art not thou the Christ; save thyself and us." v. 39-43.

iii. Proto-Luke differs here from canonical Luke as well as from Mt. and Mk. in having no reference to the darkness, the rending of the Temple veil, or the speech of the Centurion.

The Burial of Jesus -- Mt. 27:57-61, Mk. 15:42-47.

i. Here the material of v. 50-54 of Luke is probably derived from Mark so that it does not belong to Proto-Luke although found in canonical Luke.

ii. The most important departure is in connection with the action of the women, who, according to Proto-Luke, prepared the spices and ointment on the evening of the burial. According to Mk. they did this after the Sabbath was past. Mt. makes no mention of the preparation of spices.

The Resurrection Morning -- Mt. 28: 1-10, Mk. 16:1-8.

Here there are numerous differences only the more important of which will be considered.

i. If v. 10 is a Marcan insertion then Proto-Luke does not give the names of the women.

ii. In Proto-Luke there are two young men at the tomb, in Mt. one angel, and in Mk. one young man.

iii. The words addressed to the women are very similar in Mt. and Mk., but differ widely in Proto-Luke. (Cf. Mt. 28:5ff, Mk. 16:6ff, Lk. 24:5ff.)

iv. Proto-Luke of course recounts appearances mentioned nowhere else as indicated by the underlining above. In addition, the one major peculiarity of Proto-Luke is that it places all the appearances in and around Jerusalem, with no reference to the Galilean appearance recounted in Mt. 28:16ff and implied in Mk. 16:7.

Such then are the main points at which Proto-Luke differs from other Synoptic material. To these we will have occasion to refer again later.

III SOURCE CRITICISM AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

Turning now to the second of the two N. T. writings under consideration in this investigation, namely the Fourth Gospel, our first task will be to inquire briefly regarding the probable sources of that Gospel. Here we touch upon what is perhaps the most baffling of all New Testament problems; one upon which many volumes have been written, but with regard to which no agreement has been reached as yet. A detailed study of the work that has been done in this field is, of course, impossible here. Our object is merely to indicate some broad general lines of development and to mention the names of a few outstanding scholars who have been identified with each of these main lines of approach to the problem.

1. Classification of theories.

In general, critical views on this subject may be divided into three main groups, (1) The traditional, according to which the Fourth Gospel was written by John the son of Zebedee who was one of the twelve disciples of Jesus; (2) The view directly opposed to this, that it was written at a much later

date by one who was not an eye-witness of the events which he records; (3) The mediating theory which acknowledges that the Gospel did not come from the pen of John the son of Zebedee himself, but postulates a dependence of the writer upon material supplied by an eye-witness, John or some other. This group of theories may be subdivided into two, for by some this body of source material upon which the Gospel is based is thought to have existed in written form--the so-called partition theories--while others see evidence for the existence of an oral source only. But in any case it is acknowledged that this source material has undergone considerable change at the hands of the later writer and has been reinterpreted by him to a greater or less degree.

2. The traditional view.

A. Definition of position.

From not later than the end of the second century until the closing years of the eighteenth the traditional conception of Johannine authorship of this Gospel remained largely unquestioned. This theory of authorship was of course accompanied

by a high estimate of the value of the gospel as a historical document. In cases of irreconcilable differences between this account and that of the Synoptics the preference was given to the former, since it was thought to be the work, not only of an eye-witness, one of the twelve but of the one of the inner circle of three, who enjoyed, even among these, the closest intimacy with the master.

Additional material was thus accounted for by the fact that he was in possession of information of which the Synoptic writers were in ignorance, or which they, for some reason had failed to recount; while difference in interpretation was said to be due to the finer perception on the part of this disciple, of the inner and true meaning of incidents and teaching in the ministry of Jesus.

Although, as we shall see, this view has been rudely challenged during the last one hundred and twenty-five years, it has not lacked defenders even during this period. Every item of external evidence has been carefully investigated, and the Gospel itself has been minutely studied in the interests of this point of view. A vast apologetic literature has thus grown up in defense of

the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel.

B. Defenders of the position.

Among the defenders of this faith are to be found such scholars as Zahn,[79] B. Weiss,[80] Beyschlag,[81] and Godet,[82] in Germany; Lightfoot,[83] Wescott,[84] Drummond[85] and Sanday,[86] in England, and among American writers, Hayes.[87] These scholars are fully convinced that internal and external evidence alike, unite in proving Johannine authorship beyond question. They insist that all objections to such a conception which have been brought

79. Zahn, I.N.T. vol. III, p. 274-355 and Evang. Johan.

80. B. Weiss I.N.T. vol. 2, p. 355-402.

81. Beyschlag N.T. Theology vol. 1, p. 216 ff.

82. Godet, Commentary on the Gospel of St. John, Vol. 1, p. 1-300.

83. Lightfoot Essays I,II, and III, p. 1-199. Commentary p. V-XXVIII.

84. Westcott Introduction to the Study of the New Testament, p. 253-305.

85. Drummond, An Inquiry into the Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel.

86. Sanday, The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel.

87. Hayes, John and His Writings, p. 119-155.

forward by modern criticism have been satisfactorily answered and the traditional position is therefore thought to have been proven unassailable. In the enthusiastic words of one of them:

> "Everything written in opposition has been fully answered by the defenders of the authenticity of the gospel, and an illustrious line of authorities stretches over the whole period of a century and more since Evanson made his first assault and to them belongs the credit of maintaining intact the citadel of tradition which in this case as in so many others, has proved to be the citadel of impregnable truth."[88]

Nevertheless, notwithstanding the "illustrious line of defenders", and there are illustrious names in the list, the attackers do not seem to feel that they have been obliged to retire in ignominious defeat, and there is a very great question as to whether the "citadel of tradition" has been as impregnable as Dr. Hayes thinks.

3. The Critical Position.

A. Development and adherents.

The attack was begun in 1792 by

88. Hayes, op. cit. p. 153.

Evanson in his work The Dissonance of the Four Generally Received Evangelists and the Evidence of Their Respective Authenticity, although some scholars date the real beginning of the battle with the publication in 1820 of Bretschneider's work, Probabilia de Evangelio et Epistolarum Joannis Apostoli indole et origine. Strauss followed in 1835 with his Life of Christ.

A more formidable attack, however, was begun by Ferdinand Christian Bauer, 1860, and carried on by other members of the famous Tübingen school, although in a somewhat modified form by the later of these.

This group of scholars applied to the Fourth Gospel their well-known Tendenz Theorie and as a result, dated it A.D. 160-170. This position, however, has been found untenable and even scholars who do not accept a theory of Johannine authorship are inclined to make A.D. 110 the terminus ad quem in the dating of the gospel.

Other "Leaders of the opposition" in

this question are Julicher,[89] Schmiedel,[90] Wrede,[91] Wernle,[92] Pfleiderer,[93] Reville,[94] Loisy,[95] Scott.[96]

B. Arguments.

For the most part the strongest arguments of these scholars in their attack upon Johannine authorship have been based upon internal evidence. The type of thought contained in this Gospel, the conception of Jesus, His person and teaching and their significance, are said to be incompatible with the theory that it was written by a Galilean fisherman who had known Jesus in the flesh. Moreover, it is said that the impression

89. Julicher I.N.T. p. 383-429.

90. Schmiedel The Johannine Writings.

91. Wrede Charakter und Tendenz des Johannesevangeliums.

92. Wernle The Sources of Our Knowledge of the Life of Jesus. Chapt. II.

93. Pfleiderer Christian Origins.

94. Reville p. 330-360.

95. Loisy p. 5-85.

96. Scott The Fourth Gospel.

that we get of this disciple in the Synoptic Gospels is far from suggesting that he possessed the qualifications for writing such a gospel. It is also maintained that the veiled references to authorship found in the Gospel do not make it imperative to believe that it was written by John the son of Zebedee, or to identify him with the Beloved Disciple.

Although such arguments and others based upon internal evidence are, as we have said, the fundamental basis of attack, these critics have not failed to deduce external evidence in support of their position. They have attempted to prove that John suffered martyrdom at an early date, as did his brother James; they have pointed out lack of evidence for an Ephesian residence for John, and indications which point to the residence of another John in Ephesus, whose name was confused with that of the disciple John. As a result of this confusion the Gospel, really written by this John Presbyter, was erroneously attributed to the Apostle John. They likewise endeavor to show that cases which have been thought to be examples of the use of the Fourth Gospel by

early writers are really only echoes of a school of thought out of which our Gospel grew.

C. Conclusions: definition of the position.

Reasoning in this fashion these scholars feel as confident that they have established their position as do the supporters of the traditional view that theirs has never been shaken. They think they have proven beyond question that the Gospel was not written by John the son of Zebedee or indeed by any eye-witness but by a later writer who sought to interpret the Christian tradition in terms of the thought of his own age and circle. His work was to a large extent based upon the tradition embodied in the Synoptic Gospels, but his conception of Jesus and His teaching is a product of the group with whom he lived and for whom he wrote. He is telling, not what Jesus said and taught regarding Himself but the way in which Christians of that later period have come to regard Him. When he recounts incidents not found in the Synoptics he is either clothing teaching in the garb of history or giving us as occurrences material which is the product of inferences from, or speculation about Synoptic tradition. These scholars regard the Gospel as a

didactic work in the guise of history or in the words of Pfleiderer"a transparent allegory of religious and dogmatic ideas."[97]

Thus the Gospel is of little value as a source, for the study of the life of Jesus, whatever value it may have as a true interpretation of the significance of that Life, or as giving insight into the development of thought in the age for which it was written, or as devotional reading.

4. Mediating Position.

A. Definition.

So much for the two extreme positions. There remain for our consideration the views of a group of scholars who believe that the truth regarding the Fourth Gospel lies midway between these two extremes. In the words of one of them, they consider that each of these positions "is weak in that it does not give heed to what in the Gospel gives strength to the others."[98]

97. Sanday C.F.G. p. 26.

98. Garvie p. XIII.

These scholars agree with the supporters of the modern critical position in denying that the Gospel as a whole was the work of the Apostle John, but they agree with the adherents of the traditional view in recognizing a Johannine influence, or at least the influence of an eye-witness. Some, as we shall see, do not identify the eye-witness with John Zebedee, but all agree that the Gospel, particularly in the material peculiar to it, rests back upon the reminiscences of an eye-witness. They recognize, of course, that this source material has been worked over by a later writer, reinterpreted in some instances from his own point of view or that of his contemporaries, and transmuted perhaps in the crucible of his own religious experience or even, to a certain extent in that of the eye-witness himself. But the result is no mere fabrication of the writer's brain or of airy speculation upon certain Synoptic phrases.

The presence of this unique material in the Gospel is evidence for the existence of a separate cycle of tradition whose source was an eye-witness or eye-witnesses. Thus in so far as this source can be traced in the Gospel, it has a claim

for historicity equal to that of Mark.

Individual scholars in this group differ, of course, in the extent and importance which they concede to this Johannine influence. Those who accord it the greatest amount of recognition approach quite closely to the traditional view, for even the adherents of the latter acknowledge a development of thought that has taken place in the mind of the Apostle as a result of his associations through the years, his long meditation upon the profound truths of the Christian religion, and of his own mystical experience. On the other hand, those who stress more the process of development in its various stages approach more nearly to the critical position.

B. Adherents.

Of the scholars who occupy this general position the following may be noted.

Dr. H.J. Holtzmann, while in the main skeptical as to the Asian tradition of St. John and the historical character of the Gospel, leaves room for a certain amount of authentic tradition in it. He has laid stress on the fact, as Wendt, points

out.

> "that certain elements in the narrative cannot be simply derived from the leading religious ideas of the evangelist, but look like reminiscences without regard to dogma."[99]

He also argues for the existence of a Johannine circle of ideas which formed the soil out of which our Gospel grew.[100]

E. von der Goltz also argues for the existence of this Johannine cycle of ideas derived from the Apostle John, and concludes as a result that

> "besides Hellenistic and legendary elements the Gospel contains a unique and precious tradition, of the earliest Christian thought, genuine words of the Lord and historic reminiscences which must go directly back to the Apostle John."[101]

Harnack, while advocating the theory of John Presbyter as the author believes that "in some way John the son of Zebedee stands behind it."[102]

99. Einleitung p. 465 ff. See Wendt p. 51.

100. Op. cit. p. 465 ff.

101. Wendt, p. 51.

102. Harnack Chronologie I. 677.

out.

Hugo Delff also belongs to this group and is worthy of notice because he is the first to identify the Beloved Disciple with a young Jerusalemite outside the circle of the Twelve.[103]

Stanton definitely places himself among this group when he states his conclusion as follows:

> (1) "that while the framer of the statement at xxi 24, like those to whom the common tradition of the Church on the subject of the Fourth Gospel is due, was betrayed into an exaggeration when he attributed the composition of the Gospel to an immediate disciple of Christ, there was a foundation for this belief in the fact of the dependence of the writer of the Gospel on the testimony of such an immediate disciple; and farther, (2) that there are no indications pointing to someone other than John the son of Zebedee having been that disciple such as to counteract the improbability that the very existence of the right person could have been completely ignored in the Synoptic Gospels and at least almost so by the early Christian writers of the second generation, while in Church tradition a wrong one was substituted."[104]

103. Das Vierten Evangelien widergestellt.

104. Stanton p. 146.

Streeter commits himself to a similar view in the following terms:

> "The Beloved Disciple is the Apostle John idealised: the writer of the Gospel is a disciple of the Apostle."[105]

Garvie sums up his theory of an R., E., and W. as follows:

> "The Appendix on the one hand and the Prologue on the other afford us justification for distinguishing the contribution of a later editor whom we may call (R) and of the Evangelist (E) from the matter provided from the Witness (W) although this matter has also passed through the hands of the Evangelist."[106]

In his identification of the Beloved Disciple with "an influential citizen of Jerusalem" he harks back to the theory of Delff.[107]

To this group belong also Moffatt,[108] Bacon[109] and McGiffert.

5. The Partition Theories.

105. Streeter, F.G. p. 427.

106. Garvie XXI.

107. Moffatt I.N.T. p. 515-582.

108. Bacon F.G.R.D.

109. McGiffert p. 612 ff.

A. Definition.

We have still to consider the position of a group of scholars who adhere to what is known as a partition theory of the Fourth Gospel. The writers whose theories we have just studied have thought of the Johannine source as coming to the writer in the form of oral tradition, either as the instruction given by an eye-witness or as a cycle of ideas to which he had access. The adherents of the partition theory in its various forms, argue for the existence of a written source in the Fourth Gospel.

B. Development and Adherents.

This conception was first put forward by Schenkel[110] and later by Weisse[111] and Freytag.[112] It received its fullest exposition, however, by Wendt.[113]

110. Schenkel, Das Charakterbild Jesu.

111. Weisse p. 16-62.

112. Freytag, Die heiligen Schriften.

113. Wendt, The Gospel According to St. John.

A. Definition.

We have still to consider the position of a group of scholars who adhere to what is known as partition theory of the Fourth Gospel. The writers whose theories we have just studied have thought of the Johannine source as coming to the writer in the form of oral tradition, either as the instruction given by sayings-witness or as a cycle of ideas to which he had access. The adherents of the partition theory in its various forms, argue for the existence of a written source in the Fourth Gospel.

B. Development and Adherents.

This conception was first put forward by Schenkel [110] and later by Weiss [111] and Freytag [112]. It received its fullest exposition, however, by Wendt [113].

110. Schenkel Das Charakterbild Jesu.

111. Weiss p. 16-32.

112. Freytag Die heiligen Schriften.

113. Wendt The Gospel According to St. John.

He argues for the existence of a Grundschrift of discourse material and on the basis of broken connections, erroneous interpretation of certain points, and of a differing point of view he undertakes to separate this Grundschrift from the material added by a later writer.

Saltau,[114] Wellhausen[115] and Schwartz[116] have likewise developed partition theories differing widely at some points from that of Wendt, and each differing from that of the other.

Spitta[117] also has a partition theory, and he is more conservative than any of the others, except perhaps Wendt, for he attributes the written source definitely and directly to John, the son of Zebedee.

114. Unser Evangelien.

115. Wellhausen Das Evangelien Johannis.

116. Schwartz "Aporien in vierten Evangelien" dans nachrichten von der kon. Gesellschaft der Wissenachaften zu Gottingen Phil. hist. Klasse. 1 1907, 3 p. 342-372, II 1903, p. 115-148, III 1908, 2. p. 148-188, IV 1908, 5. p. 497-560.

117. Spitta Das Johannes Evangelium als Quelle der Geschichte Jesu.

Bousset[118] and E. von Dobschutz[119] express general agreement with the conception embodied in the partition theories, without having developed one of their own.

6. Conclusion.

Such then are the theories which have been wrought out in regard to the origin and source of the Fourth Gospel. To the mind of the writer some form of the mediating type of theory seems the only possible solution of the problem. The strength of such a theory is that it does give heed to what in the Gospel gives strength to each of the other two positions.

That support can be found in the Gospel for each of the extreme positions is proven by the arguments which have been amassed in their favor, the tenacity with which they have been held and the eminent scholars arrayed on each side. No theory can be satisfactory which refuses to take cognizance of, or fails to explain the characteristics

118. Bossett, p. 44 ff.

119. Stanton p. 33 ff.

of the Gospel which support either the one or the other of the two extreme positions. A mediating theory which recognizes a source in the reminiscences of an eye-witness because of its synthetic character can take care of both phases of the question, and some such theory would seem to be absolutely necessary.

Nor can such a theory be shown to be invalid by asserting the unity of the Fourth Gospel. It is a unity, but so is each of the three Synoptic Gospels. The recognition of that fact does not disprove the use of sources in the composition of the latter and no more does it do so in the case of the Fourth Gospel.

As to the extent to which a source has been employed in the Fourth Gospel, the influence it exerted on the work as a whole, the identity of the person with whom it originated--these are questions upon which certainty is less easy to attain. It is doubtful likewise whether any form of Partition theory will ever win general acceptance. But these are matters of detail and do not affect the main contention. Some form of a source hypothesis is the only type of theory that will prove at all satisfactory in an attempt to solve the Johannine problem.

IV THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND ITS RELATION TO THE SYNOPTICS.

The specific problem with which this investigation is concerned, namely that of the relationship between Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel, is, of course, closely linked up with the larger one of the relation between the Fourth Gospel and the Third as a whole, and indeed with the even broader one of the relation between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics. It is therefore imperative that we consider, at least briefly, the more general question before proceeding to the phase of it which pertains specifically to Proto-Luke.

1. Criticism and its treatment of the problem.

The problem of the relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Synoptics is a complex one, and has received no little consideration from New Testament critics.

The striking differences between the Fourth Gospel and the other three are too well-known and too generally recognized to require even a bare statement in this connection. That the Fourth Gospel differs widely from the Synoptics in regard to

content and the order in which events are recorded, in the view of Jesus which it presents and in the forms of thought in which these views are expressed, no one will question.

There remains, however, a sufficient amount of parallel material to raise the question of the dependence of the Fourth Gospel on the Synoptics. This question is made more insistent by the fact that the similarity extends in many cases to minute forms of expression. That some sort of connection exists between them is generally recognized. Even supporters of the theory that the Fourth Gospel was written by John the Apostle accept the tradition that he wrote to supplement the others, having read them and approved of them in a measure, regarding them not as false but as inadequate. They thus grant a knowledge of them on the part of the writer of the Fourth, but since he was himself one of the twelve they stop short of acknowledging his dependence upon these other writers.

Those who hold a different theory of authorship for the Fourth Gospel, are, of course, more ready to posit dependence upon Synoptic material. But even among these a considerable difference of

opinion exists as to the extent of the dependence and the closeness of the relationship.

Jülicher regards the acquaintance with and use of all three Synoptics on the part of the writer of the Fourth as practically established. He recognized that

> "any literal copying down of an earlier document is not to be thought of in the case of a writer of such independence as we know this one to be. But John, though never binding himself slavishly to any of his predecessors, is yet influenced by them even in forms of expression. All other explanations of these facts are unsatisfactory since the points of agreement between John and the Synoptics are inextricably intertwined and extend to the peculiar property of each."[120]

Wendt,[121] after a detailed consideration of parallels between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics, reaches a similar conclusion.

> "It is evident," he says, "that the Fourth Evangelist knew and made use of our three Synoptic Gospels.....A literary connection between the Synoptics and John must be acknowledged."

As to the evangelist's method of using these gospels, he says,

120. Jülicher p. 397.

121. Wendt p. 47.

> "it is characteristic that his wording coincides, in steady alteration, first with one, then--and often immediately afterwards--with another of the Synoptic Gospels. Definite reasons for these changes are generally unassignable. It is often in minutae of expression or unimportant sidestrokes in the narration, that the fourth evangelist makes a sudden change from one Synoptic Gospel to another."

He explains this procedure by assuming that the evangelist did not have

> "the actual Gospels before him as he wrote, but knew them by previous reading and hearing; and that these reminiscences of various Synoptic versions pressed upon one another in his mind as he composed his own."

He adds that in the evangelist's use of these reminiscences

> "he does not seem to be led by any sure instinct for selecting the most authentic of the parallel Synoptics."

Of recent writers, Scott [122] likewise posits a dependence upon all three.

> "John would appear to have possessed these Gospels in much the same form as we have them now, and draws freely upon them all. There is little trace of critical discrimination in his use of them. It may be said generally that for the sequence of events he gives the preference to Mark, for separate details to Matthew,

122. Scott p. 32.

> while in his large view of the significance of Christ's life and work he is most in sympathy with Luke. In the main, however, he uses the three Gospels as a single authoritative source."

Thus these writers recognize a literary connection with all three of the Synoptic writings, which of course includes that of Luke.

Bacon[123] likewise holds that a large use of Luke has been made by the Fourth Evangelist both as to motive and material.

> "In the general structure," he writes, "the outline of the Fourth Gospel.....reproduces that of Mark as modified by Luke."

Streeter also, after a study of similarities, decides in favor of a literary connection and that it is more probably between the Fourth Gospel and the Third as a whole, than between the former and Proto-Luke.[124]

Carpenter, too, recognizes Johannine dependence upon Mark and considers that the evangelist's acquaintance with Luke is fairly well established but his familiarity with Matthew is not securely made out.[125]

123. Bacon, F.G.R.D. p. 368.

124. Streeter, F.G. p. 808.

125. Carpenter p. 229-230.

On the other hand, Stanton, after a study of parallels decides that

> "the parallels with Mark certainly seem to afford evidence of an amount and kind sufficient to prove that the fourth evangelist knew that Gospel fairly well. That he knew either of the others seems more doubtful, and strange as this may seem at first sight, it is hardly to be considered so when allowance is made for the conditions which then hindered rapid multiplication and distribution of copies of books. It should also be remembered that the interval between the composition of the Fourth Gospel and the two later Synoptics need not have been more than one or two decades, if so much, and that these two Gospels were probably produced in other parts of the Christian Church."[126]

Harnack[127] decides that a connection between the Fourth Gospel and the Third cannot be proven on a linguistic basis, but leaves the question open as to the possibility of such a proof on other grounds. After having reckoned the number of words that these two writings have in common, and recognizing the scanty Johannine vocabulary, he states

> "but even taking account of this fact, we can scarcely give another verdict than

126. Stanton, p. 220.

127. Luke the Physician, p. 231.

> that no trace of the dependence of St. John upon the Lukan writings can be established by means of the lexicon. There is no connection between them in vocabulary--scarcely a single word characteristic of St. Luke can be found in St. John. Nor does it appear that the style of St. John shows any trace of the influence of the Lukan style. Nevertheless--on other grounds the possibility that the Fourth evangelist read the Lukan writings must be left open."

It may be added that a study of the work done by Sir John Hawkins[128] and that of Dr. Abbott[129] yields a similar result.

Moffatt[130] believes that the solution of the problem of the relationship of these two Gospels lies in a combination of the two theories that the two writings

> "go back independently to common traditions (or sources) and that the Fourth Gospel simply represents in one aspect the climax of a development which can be traced from Mark to Luke."

Taylor[131] adopts the former of these two but applies it to Proto-Luke. The validity of his limitation to Proto-Luke will be considered later.

128. Hawkins, H.S.

129. Johannine Vocabulary.

130. I.N.T. p. 534.

131. Taylor, B.T.G. p. 224.

2. The Problem in Relation to This Investigation.

Here then we find a difference of opinion among scholars. There is one point of agreement however. A direct dependence upon Mark is quite generally accepted, as we have seen. The problem that remains unsolved is as to what relationship exists between the Fourth Gospel and the other two Synoptics, Matthew and Luke. Inasmuch as the present investigation is not concerned with a study of the First Gospel, our problem here is reduced to the latter phase of the question, namely, the question as to what relationship may be traced between the Fourth Gospel and the Third. For this reason we turn now to a consideration of the points of contact between the Fourth Gospel and canonical Luke.

3. Points of Contact between the Fourth Gospel and Canonical Luke.

Here we will note similarities between these two documents, cases where they agree in presenting material not found elsewhere, or where they agree against the others in details of accounts common to all, or in general attitude toward a

situation.[132]

A. A statement of agreements.

i. Linguistic.

Here there is little to be said. The work of Harnack, Hawkins and Abbott has practically established Harnack's conclusion noted above[133] and we may accept his verdict that "no trace of the dependence of St. John upon the Lukan writings can be established by means of the lexicon."

ii. Narrative Agreements.

(a) The Accounts of Events.

(1) Luke differs from Mt. and Mk. in his application of words in Mt. 3:5, Mk. 1:5, and Lk. 3:3. The first say that all the region round about Jordan, that is the inhabitants of the region, went out to John, while Luke says that John came into all the region round about Jordan. With the latter, Jn. 1:28 agrees.

132. Many scholars have worked in this field and lists such as this have been formulated by Zimmermann, Easton, Taylor, Stanton, Harnack, and others. Material has been drawn from them and supplemented by original observation.

133. p. 52.

(2) In both Luke and John the declaration of John the Baptist that a mightier than he is to come, is a response to questioning on the part of someone as to whether he is the Christ or not.[134] Lk. 3:15, Jn. 1:19, 26-27.

(3) Luke says by way of introduction to the public work of John the Baptist "the word of God came unto John."[135] Lk. 3:2. Luke, it is true, uses the word ῥῆμα instead of the characteristic Johannine term λόγος but the idea conveyed is the Hebraic conception with which the Logos doctrine is so closely related if not the Johannine conception itself. The statement also corresponds to the Johannine statement regarding John that "he was a man sent from God."

(4) Only Luke and John mention Annas. Lk. 3:2, John 18:13, 24.

(5) The similarities between Luke 5:1-11 and John 21 are so evident that it has frequently been conceded that they are varying accounts of the same event. In each case the event

134. Original.

135. Original.

takes place on the Lake of Gennessaret or the Sea of Tiberias. In each there is a miraculous draught of fishes which follows a night of unsuccessful fishing, and in each Peter plays an important role and receives a commission. His self-condemnation expressed in Lk. 5:8 suggests the denial which forms the background of the story in Jn. 21.

Frequently the story of John 21 has been thought to be a revision of Luke 5:7-11. Harnack, however, would trace them to a common source in the lost ending of Mark.[136]

(6) A parallel has been noted between the story of the Centurion's Servant as told in Luke 7:1 ff. and the account of the nobleman's son in Jn. 4:46ff. In both the sufferer is "at the point of death" while Matthew says "he was sick of the palsey grievously tormented." This point, however, does not seem to be highly significant in view of the much closer agreement between the account of Mt. and Lk. In all three it is a case of healing at a distance. In the matter of relationship Taylor is no doubt right when he says

136. Luke the Physician, p. 227.

in this connection that while Lk. 7:1-10 is clearly dependent on the same source as that on which Mt. 8:5-13 depends, the material differences make it probable that the Lucan version represents the story of the Centurion's Servant as it appeared in "Q", but interpreted and supplemented by information or tradition to which the Third Evangelist had access.[137]

(7) In the story of the anointing of Jesus (Lk. 7:36-50) Luke differs from the other Synoptic accounts in saying that the woman anointed his feet, not His head, and that she wiped His feet with her hair. In these details he is in agreement with the story of an anointing in Jn. 12:1ff.

(8)[138] Mary and Martha are mentioned by Luke and John only. Lk. 10:38-42, Jn. 11:1ff, 12:2ff.

(9) The Third Gospel and the Fourth agree in making the statement that "Satan entered into Judas." (Lk. 22:3, Jn. 13:27)

137. Taylor, B.T.G. p. 150.

138. Taylor, B.T.G. p. 223.

(10) In the account of the arrest (Lk. 22:47-51, Jn. 18:3-11) there are also certain agreements between Luke and the Fourth Gospel. In neither is the kiss of Judas actually given, although it is alluded to in Lk. 22:47-48. Both specify the right ear of the servant (Lk. 22: 50, Jn. 18:10) and a similar atmosphere pervades the scene in both accounts.[139]

(11) Luke and John agree in recounting Pilate's threefold reiteration of the statement "I find no fault in this man." Lk. 23:4,14,22; Jn. 18:38, 19:4,6.

(12) Luke and John say that it was a new tomb in which Jesus was placed.

(13) Luke and John mention the appearance of two persons at the tomb (Lk. 24:4, Jn. 20:12) whereas Mark and Matthew know of only one. In Luke, however, they are men, whereas in Jn. they are angels.

(14) Luke and John relate that the women reported their discovery at the tomb to the disciples and that Peter, according to Luke,

139. The first and last part original.

Peter and another disciple, according to John, went to the tomb to verify the report. (Lk. 24:10, Jn. 20:2ff.)

(15) Luke and John recount an appearance of Jesus to the disciples on the evening of Easter Sunday, both use the same expression with regard to Jesus, that he stood in the midst αὐτὸς ἔστη ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν (Lk. 24:36) and ἔστη εἰς τὸ μέσον (Jn. 20:19) that he said εἰρήνη and showed the marks of wounds in hands and feet or side. Here we find a similar emphasis in both upon the physical nature of the resurrection appearances and yet a suggestion of something supernatural about it as well in the way in which Jesus appeared among them.

(16) They also agree in placing the resurrection appearances in Jerusalem rather than in Galilee.

(17) In both these writers there is a reference to a restoration of Peter.[140] (Lk. 22:32, Jn. 21:15-18)

140. Easton Commentary.

(18) In addition we have agreements between them in the use of certain forms of expression as Harnack and Taylor have noted.

They agree in using ὁ κύριος of Jesus, in referring to Him as the son of Joseph (Lk. 6:22, Jn. 1:45, 6:42) in representing Jesus as calling his followers οἱ φίλοι (Lk. 12:4, Jn. 15:14) and of the love of God. (Lk. 11:42, Jn. 5:42). The latter phrase does not appear in Mt. or Mk.[141]

The passage in St. Luke 22:29 καγὼ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν καθὼς διέθετο μοι ὁ πατήρ μου sounds quite Johannine.

Both evangelists either translate Aramaic words for ἑρμηνεύειν μεθερμηνεύειν or leave them out altogether.[142]

(b) Order and time of events.

(19) It has been noted that according to Luke, Jesus, after His baptism

141. Taylor, B.T.G. p. 223.

142. Harnack, Luke the Physician, p. 228.

came, not directly to Capernaum but first to Nazareth (Lk. 4:16,31) and in Jn. 2:1f a visit to Cana is recounted.[143] The importance of this similarity, however, is considerably diminished by the fact that it is generally recognized that Luke has given the rejection at Nazareth its present position because he regarded it as typical of the Jewish rejection of Jesus, and that the account itself implies earlier work in Capernaum. This foreshortening of the account of events to express a general truth or tendency is one of the striking characteristics of the Fourth Gospel. i.e. The designation of Jesus as the Messiah by John the Baptist. Jn. 1:29.[144]

(20) According to Luke and John, Jesus predicted Peter's denial while they sat at meat, (Lk. 22:31ff, Jn. 13:36ff), but according to Mt. and Mk. it was after supper on their way to Gethsemane.

iii. Allusive agreements.

(21) It has been pointed

143. Zimmermann Theol. Studien und Kritiken.

144. Original.

out that the use of the term ὑπέστρεψεν in Lk. 4:14 and the reference to Jesus's lament over Jerusalem in Lk. 13:34 which only Luke gives in this early telling, suggests earlier work in and around Jerusalem which agrees with the Johannine representation.[145]

(22) Luke's use of the surname Simon Peter in 5:8 shows that he must have thought it previously given. (Jn. 1:42ff) suggests the origin of such a conception.

(23) In the lists of disciples in Lk. 6:16ff "Judas son of James" corresponds to the "Judas not Iscariot" of Jn. 14:22.

(24) A journey through Samaria is mentioned by both evangelists. Lk. 9:52ff, Jn. 4. The fact that John the son of Zebedee figures in this incident is not without significance as we shall have occasion to note later.

(25) The names of Peter and John are given in Lk. 22:8 and not in the parallel accounts in Mt. and Mk., and they are given together in Luke 9:28 in contrast with the accounts in Mt. and

145. Zimmermann op. cit.

Mk. These and the combining of these two names in Acts 3:1,11 and 8:14 agree with Jn. 21:1ff which pictures Peter and John together.

(26) The discussion on the question of true greatness which Luke places in connection with the Last Supper corresponds to the object lesson on the same subject which John recounts in the same connection. Luke and John are thus in agreement in representing more extensive instruction as being given in connection with the Supper (Jn. 13-17), although aside from this point of contact they differ as to the content of the conversation.

iv. Similarity in type of thought and common interest.

(27) Both show considerable interest in John the Baptist, particularly in the question of his relation to Jesus, and seem almost to exhibit a polemical attitude towards him.

(28) Both show an interest in miracles, Luke by a tendency to prefer the more to the less miraculous account of an event, and John by stressing their importance as signs.[146]

146. Original.

(29) Yet each is marked by the non-appearance of exorcisms in his Gospel.

(30) The prominent place given to women in the Third Gospel is one of its generally recognized characteristics. The same is true of the Fourth Gospel to a slightly less degree.[147]

(31) Another well-defined characteristic of the Third Gospel is its interest in Samaritans, (Lk. 9:31ff, 10:30-37, 17:11-19). A contact of Jesus with Samaritans is also recounted in Jn. 4:1-42.

(32) The tendency of both these documents to emphasize the conception of a bodily resurrection of Jesus has already been noted.

(33) There is in Luke a Johannine tendency to regard events sub specie eternitatis as shown in Luke 9:51, 10:16, 22:14.

Harnack has noted other Johannine characteristics in the Third Gospel.[148]

(34) "In Christology St. Luke approaches to

147. See Harnack's discussion of this point in Luke the Physician p. 154 and footnote.

148. Harnack, op. cit. p. 226.

the Johannine type.

a. Jesus is ὁ σωτήρ Luke 2:11, John 4:42; the word is wanting in Mark and Matthew; he brings τὴν σωτηρίαν Luke 1:69,71,77, St. John 4:22, wanting in Mark and Matthew. γνῶσις σωτηρίας (St. Luke 1:77) suits John even better than Luke.

b. For Luke also the goal of the earthly history of our Lord is his ascension into heaven. 9:51.

c. Also in St. Luke Jesus is brought into contrast with the devil as the being into whose power the world is delivered, who is accordingly ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου (4:6ff).

d. Also in St. Luke our Lord knows the thoughts before they are uttered. (4:8)

e. In this Gospel also Jesus passes through the midst of his foes without their being able to lay hands on him. (4:29)."

149
(35) The Holy Spirit

149. Original.

(the Paraclete) plays an important part in both the Third and Fourth Gospel, a part such as it does not have in the other two, e.g. Luke says (4:1) that Jesus was full of the Holy Spirit when he returned from the Jordan. In 11:13 he says, "how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him" instead of the "good things" of Mt. 7:11. In 10:21 he says as Mt. does not that Jesus "rejoiced in the Holy Spirit." In 12:12 the change from Matthew's phraseology which we have noted above to "the Holy Spirit shall teach you in that very hour what ye ought to say" resembles Jn. 14:26 "the Holy Spirit--he shall teach you all things." This interest in the Holy Spirit finds, of course, its fullest expression so far as the Gospels are concerned in Jn. 14-17.

(36) The catholicity[150] of the Third Gospel may also be compared with the "universal" character of the teaching of the Fourth.

(37) In the material peculiar to the Third Gospel there is found an emphasis on individual relationships which has

150. Original.

caused this Gospel to be spoken of as the Gospel of the individual. A similar emphasis appears in the Fourth Gospel as a study of the account of Jesus's interviews with the Samaritan woman and Nicodemus will show.

B. Conclusion to be drawn therefrom.

Here then we have noted thirty-seven points of unquestionable agreement between the Third Gospel and the Fourth in matters in which each departs from the Mt. - Mk. tradition. A consideration of these can lead to but one conclusion. They are so numerous and striking and extend to conceptions that are so fundamental in the thought of each Gospel that there is possible only one answer to the problem we set out to discover. There must be a relationship of some sort between the Fourth Gospel and canonical Luke. There remains, however, the further question as to the nature of this relationship.

In our approach to this phase of the problem, we shall treat first the question as to whether this relationship extends to all of canonical Luke or is limited to Proto-Luke. If the

latter should prove to be the case, we may limit our further consideration of the nature of the relationship to that which exists between the Fourth Gospel and Proto-Luke, since it is with the latter document that we are concerned here.

4. The Extent of the Relationship.

A. The Linguistic Evidence.

Here again we can gain little evidence from a study of language. As we have noted, it is generally agreed among supporters of the Proto-Luke theory that there is no appreciable linguistic or stylistic difference traceable between Proto-Luke and the remainder of the Third Gospel. It is this fact which has seemed to point directly to the Lucan authorship of the earlier document. This being the case it is not possible to discover on the basis of language whether the connection is more probably with Proto-Luke than with the Gospel as a whole.

In the second place, if we recall once more our agreement with the verdict of Harnack and others that language agreements furnished little

evidence for a relation between the two documents as a whole, it will be clear that not much light will be shed from this source upon the problem of the unique relation of Proto-Luke.

One fact, however, may be noted in this connection. The twenty-five words which Harnack[151] has noted as being common to Luke and John alone are used 35 or 36 times in Luke. Of these thirty-six, twenty-eight are to be found in Proto-Luke. That a large proportion of them should be here is, of course, to be expected since this is the section containing the peculiar Lucan material. Yet if the writer of the Fourth Gospel had used the Lucan work as a whole it would have been possible, indeed probable, that more of them should have been found elsewhere in the book. This fact then indicates that the relationship is at least closer between the Fourth Gospel and this section than with the remainder of the Gospel.

Nothing further can be said on the basis of language except to note the negative consideration that a connection with the remainder of

151. Luke the Physician p. 231.

evidence for a relation between the two documents as a whole, it will be clear that not much light will be shed from this source upon the problem of the unique relation of Proto-Luke.

One fact, however, may be noted in this connection. The twenty-five words which Harnack[151] has noted as being common to Luke and John alone are used 35 or 36 times in Luke. Of these thirty-six, twenty-eight are to be found in Proto-Luke. That a large proportion of them should be here is, of course, to be expected since this is the section containing the peculiar Lucan material. Yet if the writer of the Fourth Gospel had used the Lucan work as a whole it would have been possible, indeed probable, that more of them should have been found elsewhere in the book. This fact then indicates that the relationship is at least closer between the Fourth Gospel and this section than with the remainder of the Gospel.

Nothing further can be said on the basis of language except to note the negative consideration that a connection with the remainder of

151. Luke the Physician p. 231.

the Book cannot be proven by language agreements.

B. The evidence from the location of the agreements.

Much more important for the problem under discussion is a consideration of the location in the Third Gospel of the thirty-seven similarities we have noticed. Twenty-six of these we have classed as narrative or allusive agreements and out of this number only four are found outside of Proto-Luke.[152] The remaining eleven are all from Proto-Luke and are points at which Proto-Luke departs from the Mt. - Mk. tradition as we noted at the end of the second section of this investigation.

Moreover, a consideration of the similarities in the type of thought and common interests gives a similar result. Three of Harnack's points of similarity in Christology are found outside of Proto-Luke.[153] With this single exception

152. The phrase "Satan entered into Judas, Lk.22:3 is not in Proto-Luke p. 58. The phrase "and struck off his right ear" Lk. 22:50 is likewise excluded. No. 3 and No. 5 of the allusive agreements p. 126 are from material not found in Proto-Luke.

153. No. 8 of these agreements Lk. 2:11, 1:69,71,77.

these similarities in the type of thought are all equally characteristic of Proto-Luke or find particular expression there. i.e. The interest in miracle, the non-appearance of exorcisms, the prominent place given to women, the interest in Samaritans, etc. Every example of the last mentioned is found in Proto-Luke. And so we might go through the list and find the same to be true of all.

Viewed thus it is clear that what is shown by these lists of similarities is primarily a connection between the Fourth Gospel and Proto-Luke rather than between the former and canonical Luke as a whole. Once more we arrive at the conclusion that at least the relationship of John with the earlier document is much closer than with the later.

C. The evidence of unique agreements.

But most important of all for the solution of our problem is the fact that Proto-Luke agrees with the Fourth Gospel at points in which the former departs not only from Mt. and Mk. but from canonical Luke itself. There are five of these to be considered.

i. In regard to the Triumphal Entry.

Vincent Taylor[154] having decided that Lk. 19: 28-36 ~~are~~ is not a part of Proto-Luke contrasts as we have seen the account of the Triumphal Entry as found in Proto-Luke with that of Mt. and Mk. The Fourth Gospel agrees with Proto-Luke in that it does not give the story of the obtaining of the colt but passes it over with the simple remark, "Jesus having found a young ass, sat thereon." Jn. 12:14.

ii. The Cleansing of the Temple.

Taylor also decides against the inclusion of Lk. 19:45-46 in Proto-Luke and goes on to point out that in that case Proto-Luke agrees with the Fourth Gospel in making no mention of the Cleansing of the Temple in connection with Jesus's last visit to Jerusalem.[155]

iii. The Date of the Last Supper.

This is the most important of the five unique agreements. Taylor[156] considers Lk. 22:

154. B.T.G. p. 95, 236.

155. ibid 223.

156. ibid p. 36ff.

1-13 and 22:19-20 Marcan insertions into a non-Marcan source. This non-Marcan source he thinks did not identify the Last Supper with the Passover meal. "The hour" of v. 14 does not necessarily mean the Passover if we dissociate it from the content of 1-13, and the words of v. 15 "With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer" imply the opposite. In that case the non-Marcan source, Proto-Luke, agrees with the Fourth Gospel in regard to the much-discussed question of the date of the Supper and consequently of the Crucifixion. In fact there is a significant agreement in phraseology which Taylor has not noted, but which is important in our survey of agreements and also strengthens our position with regard to v. 14. This is the close parallel between the words of that verse "and when the hour was come, he sat down" etc., and John's introduction of the account of the Supper with the words "Now before the feast of the passover, Jesus knowing that the hour was come" etc. (Jn. 13:1). John goes on to explain that it was the hour "that he should depart out of the world" etc. It is quite possible if according to Taylor's reconstruction we dissociate v. 14

from v. 1-13 that this also was "the hour" to which the writer of Proto-Luke referred although he failed to state it definitely as did John. In this whole matter at least we have a striking agreement between the two against canonical Luke.

iv. The treatment of the institution of the Supper.

In this connection we must also note that on this view of this section of Proto-Luke the Institution of the Supper is a much simpler affair and receives a much less detailed treatment than is the case in canonical Luke or Mt. or Mk. Here we have a closer approach to the Fourth Gospel which gives no account of the Institution of the Supper in this connection at all.

v. The Darkness and Rending of the Temple Veil.

Verses 44-46 of Lk. 23 are not included in Proto-Luke. That document therefore contains no reference to the Miraculous Darkness nor the Rending of the Temple veil. In this it agrees with the Fourth Gospel which gives no account of these.

D. Conclusion.

It is clear then unless we wish to account for these coincidences on the ground of mere chance--and this cannot be true of so important a matter as the dating of the Supper and Crucifixion, or the writers' attitude toward the former--we must posit a relationship between Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel apart from any that may exist between the Fourth Gospel and canonical Luke as a whole. The fact that the points of connection with the earlier section were more numerous pointed in that direction as we noted above. Now the existence of these unique agreements has confirmed that position for they are disagreements with the Third Gospel as it stands, but agreements with Proto-Luke which can only be recognized when the latter document is disinterred. Hence they cannot be accounted for by any theory of a knowledge of the Third Gospel on the part of the writer of the Fourth. In view of the unique agreements discussed above we are justified in affirming the latter fact and in passing on to inquire as to the nature of that relationship.

V PROTO-LUKE AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

1. The Problem Defined.

Having established the fact that a definite relationship exists between Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel we pass to a consideration of the nature of this connection. In other words, we must inquire how these points of connection can best be accounted for.

In the nature of the case there are, it would seem, not more than five possible explanations for the phenomena which have been brought to light. Each of these will be considered in turn.

2. Five Possible Explanations.

A. Lucan dependence upon the Fourth Gospel.

It is possible, of course, that these agreements might be explained if the writer of Proto-Luke had known the Fourth Gospel, although as we shall note later the character of the agreements in many cases would render this an unsatisfactory type of explanation. In any case, it is made impossible by the generally recognized later date of the Fourth Gospel.

Nor could the difficulty be evaded by adopting a Partition theory in regard to the sources of the Fourth Gospel. For even if we were to grant the existence of an early written source incorporated in that Gospel there is no evidence to warrant believing that such an early source was ever in general circulation. So that our problem cannot be solved by positing Lucan dependence upon an earlier Johannine source document.

B. Johannine dependence upon the canonical Gospel of Luke.

This we have already shown to be inadequate as an explanation of unique Proto-Luke phenomena.

C. Johannine dependence upon Proto-Luke.

At first glance this theory would seem to avoid the difficulties encountered by the first two. Linguistic evidence, too, would lend some support to this theory, for Harnack's list of common words, found so largely, as we have seen, in Proto-Luke, would be stronger evidence in the case of the smaller document than for the Gospel as a whole. Yet even here the number is not sufficiently

large to amount to anything like proof, particularly in view of the fact that the type of language agreement is frequently such as to admit of a different explanation.

A serious objection to this theory is the fact that there is no evidence that the document Proto-Luke ever circulated apart from the Gospel in which it was later incorporated.

The argument, however, which proves fatal to this theory as well as the first two is the fact that many of the agreements are of such a nature that they cannot be explained by any theory of documentary dependence on either side. It is not a case of direct borrowing. e.g. They both mention a questioning regarding the possibility of John the Baptist being the Messiah, but they represent the questioning as coming from different groups. (Lk. 3:15, Jn. 1:19,26-27); they both mention Annas but in an entirely different connection (Lk. 3:2, Jn. 18:13); both show an interest in Samaritans but recount entirely different incidents regarding them (Lk. 9:31ff, 10:30-37, 17:11-19, Jn. 4); Luke gives a teaching of Jesus regarding true greatness in connection with the Last

Supper, Jn. tells of an object lesson designed to impart the same truth. (Lk. 22:24ff, Jn. 13:3ff). Such agreements are not the result of documentary dependence. They indicate a no less real but a less definite type of connection.

D. Products of the same process of development.

This theory put forth by Moffatt as an explanation of the relationship between the Third Gospel and the Fourth avoids the objection just urged against the other theories but fails when applied to Proto-Luke alone because of the early date of that document. There has not been time for the approach to the Fourth Gospel to have come as a result of the development of the Mt. - Mk. tradition.

E. Common source or basis in a common tradition.

As a result of our consideration of the four theories stated above we find ourselves reduced to that of a common source for the two documents, or a basis in a common tradition. By a

process of elimination we have arrived at this as the only possible solution for our problem, or at least the best of those which have presented themselves to our mind. It remains, however, to apply it to the phenomena under consideration and see how satisfactorily it will serve as an explanation for them, before it can be declared acceptable as a theory of the relation between these two writings.

3. Application of the Theory of a Common Source or Basis in a Common Tradition.

A. Significance of the method of the formulation of Proto-Luke.

Here it will be necessary to pause for a moment and recall the manner in which, according to our theory, Proto-Luke was formulated. That was, we remember, by the combination of material which Luke had obtained from a particular source, with Logian material. Now if, as we have been led to suspect, Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel are connected at their source by having sprung from a common cycle of tradition, the place at

which Luke tapped this common source was that at which he obtained his special material which he later combined with the Logian matter.

On this view agreements might be expected to be of two kinds: (a) Certain parallelism of content would appear in this special Lucan material embodying traditions which had been preserved in this cycle only. (b) Since Luke was in possession of his material from this source first and evidently valued it highly, his knowledge of it might modify at certain points his rendering of material taken from other sources as the Logia or Mark.

Keeping these facts in mind we turn to the attempt to explain the various phenomena under discussion by means of this theory of origin in a common circle of tradition.

B. Application of this theory to linguistic situation.

Here we note first that this is precisely the theory best suited to explain the language situation which we found to exist. For in the case of origin in common tradition one would

expect to find certain agreements in language and phrasing due in part to the community of ideas being expressed and partly to a certain fixity of form which the tradition had assumed in that circle. Yet the connection would not be as close as in the case of direct literary dependence of one document upon the other.

C. Application of the theory to agreements in the two documents.

i. To agreements in a unique presentation of material found also in other Synoptic tradition.

Under this heading may be included the agreement in regard to the location of the preaching of John the Baptist, the questioning regarding his identity with the Messiah, the statement that he came from God, the account of the Centurion's Servant, the anointing of Jesus, the conception of Judas as possessed by Satan, in the matter of the arrest, the trial before Pilate, the reference to the <u>new</u> tomb and the appearance of <u>two</u> angels, in the use of certain forms of expression, the indirect return of Jesus to Capernaum, the posi-

tion of the prediction of the denial, the implication of an earlier work in Jerusalem, the early use of Peter's surname, the reference to a Judas other than Judas Iscariot, the union of the names of Peter and John and the conception that a lesson on true greatness was given in connection with the Last Supper.[157]

A review of these shows that each of them may be satisfactorily accounted for if the two documents, Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel, draw upon a common cycle of tradition. Such a cycle might very well contain peculiar conceptions regarding John the Baptist which would find somewhat different expression when two writers, both familiar with this cycle wrote of him.

The same thing may be said of the reference to Judas, points of similarity in regard to the arrest and trial, the mention of the new tomb and the number of persons seen there. That some similarity of expressions are used when much later, material from this source was incorporated in

157. Here are included numbers 1,2,3,6,7,9,10,11, 12,13,16,18,19,20,21,22,23,25 and 26 of the agreements.

the Fourth Gospel, is not surprising in view of the tendency of oral tradition to become to a certain degree stereotyped. That a particular conception of Pilate's attitude persisted in one cycle of tradition is perfectly possible and likewise peculiar features of the same resurrection story.

The placing of the resurrection appearances around Jerusalem and the difference in the time of the prediction of Peter's denial and the teaching on true greatness are conceptions that might linger among one group. The agreements in forms of expression noted by Harnack are indicative of unique conceptions which might well have arisen in one cycle of tradition particularly if that cycle were strongly influenced by the recital of one eye-witness. The placing of the rejection at Nazareth is less important, as we have noted, yet this example of a tendency to foreshorten may well have been the result of the contact of the writer of Proto-Luke with the spirit which pervaded the common source we have posited.

The allusive agreements in numbers 21,22,23 and 25 can also be understood a-

gainst the background of such a common group of conceptions.

The parallel in the account of the Centurion's Servant is of a somewhat different character. There is little reason to question the fact that it was derived from "Q". The one point that it has in common with the account of the nobleman's son in John may however be a modification due to the writer's knowledge of the other story in the common cycle of tradition. Having both stories in mind one detail of the one may easily have become attached to the other. That he did not use both stories is due to the fact that they both serve the same purpose of recounting a cure performed at a distance. Thus our theory explains this case also.

In the case of the story of the anointing of Jesus the conflicting agreements make the question of relationships a more puzzling one. The Johannine account agrees with that of Mt. - Mk. against Luke in regard to the placing of the event in the ministry of Jesus, the persons who murmured and the nature of Jesus's reply, but disagrees with them in placing the feast in the

home of Lazarus, and agrees with Proto-Luke in the points we have mentioned. The fact would seem to be that this story circulated in more than one form. Even so the coincidences of the Lucan account with the Johannine point to some common contact which has not been entirely obliterated by later modifications in the Lucan account. Such a common contact our theory explains.

ii. To agreements in the presentation of unique material.

Here we include the accounts of the miraculous draught of fishes, of the women's report of their discovery at the tomb to the disciples, and the fact that one or two of the latter went to verify the report, of the appearance to the disciples on the evening of Easter Sunday, of a restoration of Peter and of a journey through Samaria.[158]

These demand even more insistently than the others a theory of a common source for their explanation. This is true because the differences are too great to admit of

158. Here are included numbers 5,14,15,17,24.

direct borrowing of documentary independence. The miraculous draught of fishes occurs in entirely different circumstances in each, the verification of the women's report is by Peter in one, by Peter and another disciple in the other where the story is much more complete, the accounts of the appearance on Easter Sunday evening are different, and different incidents are told in connection with the journey through Samaria.

Such a body of unique material in which similarities and differences are so combined can be accounted for only on the grounds that it has been subject to modification because of being used by different writers, using different principles of selection, and at different periods.

iii. To agreements in type of thought and common interests.

Here we note the interest in John the Baptist, in miracles, in the Samaritans, the lack of interest in exorcisms, the prominent place given to women, the tendency of both these documents to emphasize the conception of a bodily resurrection of Jesus and to regard events <u>sub specie eternitatis</u>, agreements in the type of

Christology, in the attitude towards the importance of the Holy Spirit, in Catholicity and emphasis on the individual.[159]

Agreements of this type, agreements of attitude and interest could be explained only on the grounds that the writers were of a similar type of mind or belonged to the same school of thought; or on the basis of a common source in a particular cycle of tradition where such attitudes prevailed. We have no evidence that these two writers belonged to the same group of thinkers, and while the appeal that some incidents made to both may indicate some similarity of interest, it is insufficient to account for the body of phenomena as a whole. We are therefore driven back once more to our theory of a common source.

And such a theory of origin in a common cycle of tradition fits the case admirably if we think of that cycle of tradition as being largely dominated by the interpreting genius of one mind, the person whose account of things formed the nucleus of this cycle of tradition. For

159. Here are included numbers 27-37.

after all, these interests and tendencies which have been noted suggest rather a particular turn of mind than a particular stage of development. Taylor has pointed out the fact that this is true even in regard to the emphasis on the physical resurrection, and the same may be said with regard to the other peculiar interests.

If, then, we posit the existence of such a cycle of tradition with which Luke came in contact and found many attitudes with which he was in sympathy and which he expressed later in his own way in a form suitable for his readers, and think also of that cycle of tradition undergoing development, and even being transplanted to another region, and later finding another expression by another hand for other readers, then we have sufficient explanation for the similarity of interests which we find expressed in these two writings under different form.

The fact that they are expressed in different form makes documentary dependence here also impossible. Our theory is adequate and the only possible one.

iv. To agreements with regard to

persons who are mentioned in these documents only. These are Annas and the sisters Mary and Martha.[160] Now it is perfectly possible that the connection of certain people with the Gospel tradition might be preserved in one cycle of tradition and in no other. In the case of Martha we find the same characterization of her suggested in both, though in a different way in each, namely that of serving. (Lk. 10:40, Jn. 12:2). These too, then, can be explained by the theory of origin in a common cycle of tradition in which doings and characteristics of these people were recounted.

v. To the agreements in the five Proto-Luke digressions from canonical Luke.

These too may be best explained by the fact that each writer was drawing upon a cycle of tradition which contained no account of the obtaining of the colt, (the writer of the Fourth Gospel may have found it in Mark later, and not being greatly interested in it mentioned it only casually) no mention of the cleansing of the Temple in connection with the last visit of Jesus to

160. Agreements 4 and 8.

Jerusalem, or of the darkness or rending of the Temple veil, but which did have its own peculiar date for the Supper but little emphasis on the institution of a rite in connection with it.

D. Conclusion.

The fact that such a line of tradition is found in both Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel in contrast to the others makes it necessary to posit a common cycle of tradition or two lines of tradition in early Christian thinking which contained these conceptions. But to follow the latter course is to "multiply entities beyond necessity." The much saner course is to apply "Occam's razor" which leaves us again with our theory of contact with a common cycle of tradition as our explanation. That solution has proved adequate for every phase of the problem.

4. The Theory of a Common Source in Relation to the Source-Criticism of the Fourth Gospel.

One more point remains to be noted in connection with this theory, namely that it is in harmony with the mediating type of theory in the

source-criticism of the Fourth Gospel; the theory which we found in our survey to be the most satisfactory solution of that problem. This, of course, could have no primary significance for our problem here. But having arrived at a conclusion, by another route, that conclusion is strengthened by being found to be in harmony with the results of another branch of criticism.

5. Summary and Conclusion.

What then can be said for the theory that the relationship between Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel is one of the sources which take their rise in a common cycle of tradition? Four points may be noted.

A. It was the theory to which we were driven by a process of elimination.

B. It has proved adequate as an explanation for all the phenomena in question.

C. It explains phenomena for which no other theory can render a satisfactory account.

D. It is in harmony with the best solution in the source-criticism of the Fourth

Gospel.

Therefore, the theory of origin in a common cycle of tradition stands approved as the most satisfactory account of the relationship existing between Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel.

VI SIGNIFICANCE OF THE HYPOTHESIS OF A COMMON ORIGIN FOR PROTO-LUKE AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

1. For the Fourth Gospel.

A. As to theories of source.

i. Basis in an early tradition.

In attempting to ascertain the significance of such a conception for the criticism of the Fourth Gospel, we shall consider first its bearing upon the four types of source hypothesis set forth in a preceding section. (see section 3).

Here it appears at once that the theory of a common origin militates against the extreme critical position. For if certain extra-Synoptic material in the Fourth Gospel originally proceeded from the same source as did a part of the material of Proto-Luke, the former cannot, in view of the early date of Proto-Luke, have been merely the product of the speculations of second century writers.

On the other hand, it yields no evidence for the traditional position that the Fourth Gospel as a whole was the work of the Apostle

John, for the types of thought and conceptions in this Gospel which have seemed to scholars to indicate that it belongs to a later period, are not paralleled in the document Proto-Luke. This is not of course, direct evidence against the theory, for even traditionalists, as we have seen, admit a development in the thought of the writer during the period which intervened between the time when he witnessed the events which he records and the later date when he wrote them down. Our point is merely that this hypothesis of a common source for the two writings cannot be used in support of the traditional position.

Nor can it be said to lend support to the partition theories for there is no evidence, linguistic or stylistic, to indicate that Proto-Luke was based, even in part upon any written document which might later have been used in the composition of the Fourth Gospel and which by a comparison with Proto-Luke might be disinterred from the larger work.

The theory, however, which, as we have noted, [161] it does support so strongly as to

161. p. 155.

almost amount to proof if we admit the validity of a theory of common origin, is the more general mediating position that the matter peculiar to the Fourth Gospel rests back upon a particular cycle of early traditions which have their source in the reminiscences of an eye-witness or eye-witnesses.

If we have succeeded in showing, as we think we have, that elements in the matter peculiar to the Fourth Gospel existed in the tradition which Luke utilized in the composition of Proto-Luke, then they are fragments of a tradition reaching back to the early date of the formulation of that document; a tradition which in all probability in the case of Luke came directly from eye-witnesses.

Thus the theory of Proto-Luke and the relationships which we have observed to exist between that document and the Fourth Gospel does not, as Taylor[162] says, serve to reestablish extreme views regarding the Johannine authorship of the latter, but it does strongly support the

162. Taylor B.T.G. p. 226.

mediating position regarding the sources employed in its composition.

ii. The Zebedean authorship of the Johannine source.

The next question we may ask is whether or not our hypothesis of a common origin suggests any clue as to the identity of the eye-witnesses or eye-witness upon whose reminiscences this unique tradition was based. For, as we have seen, recognizing the existence in the Fourth Gospel of a contribution from an eye-witness does not necessarily mean acknowledging the influence of the Apostle John.

Here very little of importance can be said. The fact that the appearance of this tradition in Proto-Luke proves its existence at so early a date, puts it back into the period when it might have originated with the Apostle John. This, however, gives no grounds for concluding that it did originate with him rather than with other eye-witnesses of the same period.

The high esteem in which Luke appears to have held this source does suggest that it might have come from such a one as the Apostle

John, directly or indirectly, but this is no more than a suggestion.

On this point our hypothesis yields no very fruitful results, although it will be necessary to touch upon it again later from a slightly different angle.

iii. Content of the source in the Fourth Gospel.

Here our hypothesis once more becomes highly significant. On this view we have for the first time an objective criterion by which to test the material in the Fourth Gospel for the purpose of ascertaining what parts of it may have belonged to the early source employed in its composition.

Hitherto it has been the weakness of all attempts, whether on the part of partition theorists or of others, to separate a source in the Fourth Gospel, that no such objective criterion existed. Their designations of such a source were necessarily based upon such considerations as supposed distinctions in the type of thought, apparent breaks in the connection of the text as it stands or of the inherent probability of the trust-

worthiness of certain sections. It is clear that all such considerations admit of too large an element of subjectivity to permit of their results being generally recognized as firmly established. Thus such a study of the Fourth Gospel has been greatly handicapped in comparison with a similar study of the two later Synoptics.

Now, as we have said, according to our theory, Proto-Luke provides this much-needed criterion. Material in the Fourth Gospel whose existence or influence can be traced in Proto-Luke must, of course, have formed a part of the common early tradition out of which both have grown, and can therefore be assigned to the source material of that Gospel.

It must be recognized, of course, that more material may have come from that source than can be recognized by this test, for Luke may not have obtained all that existed in that cycle of tradition and may have failed to use or show the influence of all that he did obtain. But at least all that does meet this test must be included in the source, and may be used as a basis for distinguishing additional source material. For

the latter might be expected to possess certain characteristics in common with what can be distinguished by the first method. This second step, however, will not be attempted in the present study.

Using this method, however, we will review briefly our study of the parallels between these two documents with a view to discovering some material in the Fourth Gospel which on this basis may probably be assigned to the source. But no attempt will be made to discriminate in each case between what part of the account was drawn from the original source and how much in all probability is due to a development of thought or the additions by a later hand. That would be necessary in a study in Johannine criticism. Here we are interested merely in suggesting the possibilities which this theory offers in this connection, by giving an example of the beginning that may be made on the basis of the hypothesis under consideration.

Accordingly we will note the following sections of Johannine material which may, on this view, be considered as based on the early source.

Chapt. 1. (a) The references to John the Baptist in 6-8 and 15-28. In v. 6 is found the parallel with Proto-Luke which we have noted in

the conception of John as "a man sent from God."

In the second of these two sections there are three points of similarity with Proto-Luke. In v. 16-17 there is an emphasis upon grace with which may be compared Lk. 4:22. In 19-28, there is the questioning regarding John on the part of the authorities which, as we have seen, is comparable with that of the people in Luke. v. 28 agrees with the Lucan reference to the place of John's preaching.

(b) 35-42. Here we have the account of the giving of Peter's surname which we have noted is presupposed in Proto-Luke's early use of it.

Chapt. 2. If we admit that Proto-Luke and John are in agreement in representing Jesus as not going directly to Capernaum but stopping in the one case in Nazareth, in the other in Capernaum, (see No. 19.) then the foundation of the story of a visit to Cana must have belonged to the early source. (v. 1,11-12).

Chapt. 4.

(a) v. 1-42 must be based on this early tradition for here we have the account

of the journey through Samaria and an example of an interest in Samaritans which are two of the notable points of agreement with Proto-Luke.

(b) v. 46-54. Here we have the story of the cure of the nobleman's son an influence of which we have been able to trace in the Lucan account of the Centurion's Servant.

Chapt. 9. This account of the curing of the blind man with its threefold reference to casting out from the synagogue (v. 22,34,35) may be echoed in Proto-Luke (6:22) in its change from the phraseology of Mt. to "separate you." If so, this story must be also of early origin.

Chapt. 11. The basis of the first part of this story at least must have been found in the common cycle of tradition for it is here that Mary and Martha are portrayed. It has been contended that the latter part of the story, the raising of Lazarus is based upon the Lucan parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Lk. 16:19-31) with its reference to one rising from the dead. In that case this part of the story would be a development from a basis in the common source since Lk. 16:19-31 belongs there.

This conception however is not proven but there is at least a point of connection here.

Chapt. 12. Here v. 1-9 must have its basis in the early tradition for here again Mary and Martha have a place, and we have noted the points of connection with the account of the anointing in Proto-Luke. Here,also,is the attribution of service to Martha (v. 2) which agrees with Luke 10:40.

v. 12-15 must also have been based upon the early tradition if we agree it came from a source which did not have the account of the obtaining of the colt.

Chapt. 13. Here we have many evidences of the connection of this passage with the early source.

(a) Its agreement with Proto-Luke as to the date.

(b) The object lesson on true greatness corresponding to the teaching on that subject in this connection by Proto-Luke.

(c) The use of the common phrase regarding Judas, that "Satan entered into him." (v.27)

(d) The prediction of Peter's denial in connection with the Supper. v. 36-38.

Thus this whole section may be regarded as based on the early tradition.

Chapts. 14-17. We have noted that Proto-Luke's position implies that there was more instruction given in connection with the Supper than the other Synoptics relate, thus indicating that the teaching of these chapters may be based on material from the early tradition. A few points of detail bear out this conclusion; (a) the reference to another Judas in v. 22 which we have seen is parallelled in Proto-Luke; (b) the presence of the Lucan characteristic of the prominence given to the Spirit in these chapters, in particular the reference to the teaching function of the Spirit. (v. 14:26-Lk. 12:12).

(c) The reference to his disciples as friends. (v. 15:15, cf. - Luke 12:4).

Chapt. 18. The account of the arrest. 1-15.

(a) The points of similarity with regard to Judas.

(b) The agreement with Proto-Luke in the mention of the <u>right</u> ear. (v. 10).

(c) The reference to Annas. v. 13.

The account of the trial before the Jewish authorities. Here also is a reference to Annas. v. 24.

Chapt. 19. The Trial before Pilate. (18:28-19:16). Here we have the similar conception of Pilate's attitude with his threefold declaration

of the innocence of Jesus (18:38, 19:4,6) which is also found in Proto-Luke. Thus these sections must be based on material from the early source.

Chapt. 20. (a) v. 1-10--the account of the visit to the tomb with its agreement with Proto-Luke regarding Peter's visit to verify the story of Mary.

(b) v. 19-25. The account of the appearance to the disciples on the evening of Easter Sunday, with which Proto-Luke agrees.

(c) These resurrection stories also agree with Proto-Luke in placing the appearances in Jerusalem, another indication that they are rooted in the common tradition.

Chapt. 21. Because of its points of connection with the miraculous draught of fishes in Lk. 5:1-11 this story also must have its ultimate source in the common tradition.

Such dominant interests as those shown in the Samaritans, in the prominence given to women, in miracles and in an emphasis on the universal element in the Gospel tradition are also no doubt due in large part to the influence of the early tradition, since they appear in both documents under consideration.

This study is not exhaustive by any means and does not extend to minute details of expression, but it is deemed sufficient to illustrate the importance of this theory for any attempt to trace an early source in the Fourth Gospel.

B. Historicity of the Fourth Gospel.

The hypothesis of a common source for Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel lends its support to the attribution of historical value to the latter at two points. In the first place it does so by producing evidence for the existence in that Gospel of an early tradition, thus increasing the probability of the historical trustworthiness of the Gospel as a whole, at least in so far as it is based upon this earlier tradition which it embodies. It is true that an early date does not prove historicity, and other tests must be applied before the accuracy of an account can be accepted, but, other things being equal, an earlier date increases the probability of historical trustworthiness. At least to have shown that the Gospel, where it departs from the main Synoptic tradition is not entirely the product of the speculations of a second century writer is to have gone a long way in re-establishing its claim to historical trustworthiness.

In the second place, the estimate which Luke placed upon this source argues for a

high regard for its value as trustworthy tradition. Not only did he incorporate it in his early work, Proto-Luke, but when he came to write his Gospel he made the work in which it was incorporated the basis of his later writing, evidently preferring it in general and in some particulars to the account which he found in Mark. The judgment of a writer of that early period, a writer such as Luke whose aim while not primarily historical had yet a larger element of that interest than that of the other Gospel writers, should carry some weight. And in so far as it is to be considered, it argues for the trustworthiness of this unique early tradition which later found expression in the Fourth Gospel, and so for the trustworthiness of that Gospel as a whole in which it is embodied.

2. For Proto-Luke.

A. For the validity of the Proto-Luke theory.

But the significance of the connection between these two New Testament writings is not exhausted when we have considered its impor-

B. For Proto-Luke.

A. For the validity of the Proto-Luke theory.

tance for the Fourth Gospel. It has a bearing on the other writing as well.

Here we may note in the first place that the fact that it is possible to establish such a relationship between the document Proto-Luke and another New Testament writing lends cogency to the Proto-Luke theory itself. If there were no indications of a relationship of any kind existing between the document postulated by this theory and any other New Testament writing, if that document were left completely isolated, its existence, while not disproven, would seem to be more doubtful than it is with the relationship established.

In the second place this relationship gives a sort of pragmatic sanction to the theory. The fact that it not only provides a solution for the problem of the additional material in the Third Gospel, but also offers a clue which aids in the solution of the vexed Johannine problem adds to the probability of the validity of the theory.

B. For the historical value of the unique material in Proto-Luke.

As the theory of relationship increases the probability of the trustworthiness of the tradition in the Fourth Gospel, so on the other hand it does the same for the unique material of Proto-Luke. The fact that Luke in making his own original contribution to the Gospel account used as a source a cycle of tradition, which was not only held in high esteem by him, but which possessed sufficient credibility and vitality to persist through the years and find expression again in a later work, argues for the truth of this tradition which warranted its preservation by at least one circle of believers.

C. For the origin of the unique Lucan material.

This theory of a common source offers at least a suggestion as to the ultimate origin of the peculiar Lucan material which was given its first written expression in Proto-Luke, namely that of its connection with John the son of Zebedee or a circle in which his rendering of the Gospel tradition was perpetuated.

i. The Fourth Gospel tradition.

The first clue to such a conception is found in the Fourth Gospel tradition which attributes that work to John the son of Zebedee. Now this tradition is accounted for by most scholars who hold to a mediating source hypothesis for this Gospel, by attributing the source, directly or indirectly, to this Zebedean John. But if this be true, and Stanton's position[163] here seems to the present writer unassailable, and the special material of Proto-Luke comes from the same cycle of tradition, as our theory assumes, it is clear that the results of our investigation are at least pointing toward the conception of a connection, direct or indirect, between the Lucan material and a Zebedean source.

It remains to test such an hypothesis by what we can surmise of the means by which Luke came into possession of his special information.

ii. Opportunity for contact with a Zebedean cycle of tradition.

We know that John remained for

163. Stanton. Vol. 3, P.

some time in the Jerusalem Church for he was there at the time of the council (Gal. 2:9). How much longer he was there we do not know. It is possible then that there might have formed round him while there a circle of friends who became particularly familiar with his way of telling the Gospel story, which in those plastic days might have differed somewhat in its points of emphasis, from that of the other followers, even as he differed from them. When, therefore, Luke later came with Paul to Jerusalem and Caesarea he might easily have come into contact with some members of this Johannine circle if not with John himself. If John later, either before Luke's Jerusalem visit or after, removed to Ephesus some of this group of intimate friends may well have gone with him, forming the nucleus of a new Johannine circle; and the source which afterwards found expression in the Fourth Gospel would be the same cycle of tradition which at an earlier time Luke had tapped, changed and developed through the years as a result of the passing of time and the influence of the new intellectual environment into which it had been transferred. Thus such a common Zebedean source for Proto-Luke is well with-

in the bounds of possibility.

iii. The appeal for Luke of a Zebedean tradition.

When we add to this the appeal which such a tradition, based as it would be claimed on the witness not only of one of the twelve but of a member of the "inner circle" in that group, would have for Luke, particularly if some of the attitudes which it expressed were specially congenial to him, it is evident that such a conception coincides perfectly with the high value which he did indeed seem to place upon the information gained from this source, as we have seen.

iv. Criticism of the common conception as to the origin of this Lucan material.

One point remains for consideration, namely, the fact that Philip or Philip's daughters have been mentioned as the chief source of this Lucan material by many scholars, and by both of the two chief supporters of the Proto-Luke theory.[164] This conception is defended on the grounds of the prominence given to women in this material and of the presence of a strongly-marked Samaritan interest. The former is attributed to the

164. Sanday, Streeter, Taylor.

influence of Philip's daughters (Acts 21:9) and the latter is connected with the reference to Philip's work in Samaria (Acts 8:4ff). But these facts, whether considered separately or taken together are not sufficient to prove that this special Lucan tradition necessarily took its rise with Philip.

The fact that a feminine interest appears in this material does not necessarily imply feminine authorship. Indeed it seems to the writer much more likely that such an one as the Beloved Disciple might well have been, should have caught some of the implications of the Master's attitude to women which he had seen Him assume, and should have expressed something of these new conceptions when recounting events, than that women themselves, as a result of their contact with the new faith should be found deliberately pushing their sisters into the narrative as a means of demonstrating that a new order of things was about to be established.

Nor would the Samaritan interest necessarily mean that Philip was involved. Here it may be well to recall that John was one of the two apostolic representatives sent by the Jerusalem

Church to inspect the work being done in Samaria when news of it reached Jerusalem. (Acts 8:14). Now unless we assume that these men were sent with a definite commission to stamp out the work, and the account as it stands does not warrant such an assumption, it is not likely that those most bitterly opposed to such an innovation would be sent. If it were a mission of fair investigation for the satisfaction of those in Jerusalem who were inclined to question the wisdom of the step Philip had taken, it is more likely that some of those most favorably disposed towards it would volunteer to go and would be permitted to do so. And John was one of them.

At least having seen the work they gave it their sanction. May it not have been that the impression which this incident made upon John, together with his recollection of the Master's attitude toward these people on certain occasions, for instance when he wanted to call down fire on them, influenced him sufficiently to account for the interest in them which we find reflected in both Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel?

At least the case for the theory

which would trace the special Lucan material to Philip is not proven. Other explanations may be offered for the phenomena for which this theory seeks to give an account. Thus the way is open for the acceptance of a theory which posits a Zebedean source for this material.

Our conclusion then is that the hypothesis of a common origin for Proto-Luke and the Johannine source, while it may not prove, nevertheless points quite definitely to a Zebedean source for Proto-Luke. While the suggestion which our hypothesis offers at this point has been considered of sufficient importance to merit the space devoted to it, and, to the mind of the present writer is not without significance in connection with the Johannine problem, it is nevertheless not an integral part of our main contention. It may be accepted or rejected without affecting the latter. Whether a connection with John, the son of Zebedee, is maintained or not, the fact remains that a relationship exists between Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel which can only be explained on the basis of a common origin, and that such a conclusion has an important bearing on the study of both documents.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS.

1. That while the Two-Source theory is one of the generally accepted positions in Synoptic criticism and may be said to be practically established, it is inadequate as a complete solution for all the phases of the Synoptic problem. It needs to be supplemented and thus leaves room for a theory such as Proto-Luke.

2. That the theory of Proto-Luke, while it cannot be said to be generally accepted, nevertheless offers a solution for the problem of the peculiar Lucan material which merits consideration; and that it is sufficiently well defended to warrant its being assumed as an hypothesis for an investigation of this kind.

3. That a relationship of some kind exists between the Fourth Gospel and the Third.

4. That there is a closer relationship between the Fourth Gospel and Proto-Luke as distinct from that which the former bears to canonical Luke as a whole.

5. That the connection is not to be explained by a theory of direct documentary dependence on the

part of either.

6. That the theory of origin in a common cycle of tradition is the most satisfactory explanation of this relationship which has been shown to exist between the Fourth Gospel and Proto-Luke.

A. Because it is the theory to which we were driven by a process of elimination.

B. It explains all the phenomena.

C. It explains some phenomena for which no other theory gives an adequate explanation.

D. It is in harmony with the most approved position of the Source-criticism of the Fourth Gospel.

7. That this theory has significance for the criticism of the Fourth Gospel.

A. It proves that the extra-Synoptic material etc, in the Fourth Gospel is based upon an early unique tradition, thus supporting what we have termed the mediating position in the source-criticism of the Fourth Gospel.

B. It tends to favor the connection of this source with John the son of Zebedee, but the evidence it yields on this point is very slight.

C. It furnishes a criterion for measuring the content of the material in the Fourth Gospel which may be assigned to this early source.

D. It furnishes fresh evidence for the historicity of the Fourth Gospel.

8. That this hypothesis has significance also for Proto-Luke.

A. It furnishes evidence for the validity of the Proto-Luke theory.

B. It tends to increase the value to be attributed to Proto-Luke as an historically trustworthy document.

C. It points toward the conception of a Zebedean source for the material peculiar to Proto-Luke.

SUMMARY.

In the first section we have made a brief survey of the Two-Source theory in Synoptic criticism, a study which was meant to serve as a background for the investigation which was to follow. Here we sought to define the Synoptic problem and to consider its importance from three standpoints, literary, exegetical, and in relation to the Fourth Gospel.

Having reviewed the history of the treatment of this problem by the early Church, in the Middle Ages, and in modern criticism, we classified the theories that have been propounded as follows: (a) Oral tradition theories, (b) those of documentary sources. The latter include (a) Theory of an Urevangelium, (b) Fragment Hypothesis, and (c) mutual dependence theories.

A study of the present status of Synoptic criticism showed (a) a general tendency toward a synthesis of the theories and (b) that there exists among scholars a fair amount of agreement on certain major problems in this field. Among these generally accepted positions, we noted (a) rejection of the

oral tradition theory, (b) acceptance of the priority of Mark and its use by Matthew and Luke, (c) the recognition of a "Q" source common to Matthew and Luke, (d) a combination of the two last-mentioned resulting in a general acceptance of the Two-Source theory.

Our final point in this section was a consideration of the merits of the Two-Source theory, and of some problems which it leaves unsolved. As a result we reached the conclusion that while the Two-Source theory is generally accepted and may be said to be practically established in that it contains the key to the Synoptic problem, it is inadequate as a complete solution. It needs to be supplemented, and so leaves the way open for a theory such as that of Proto-Luke.

Our second section dealt with a presentation of the Proto-Luke theory. Going back we noted the problems in the Third Gospel which were left unsolved by the Two-Source theory, namely, the problem of omissions from one of the two sources, of additions to material found in the two sources, and of other variations from them. Attempted solutions for these problems were also noted with the objec-

tions to each. This formed our approach to the Proto-Luke theory, the last of these attempted solutions.

A detailed study of the theory as it has been presented by Streeter and Taylor, followed. Its points of connection with preceding source theories of the Third Gospel were noted. As a result it was seen to stand in a direct line of development with a certain class of theories previously persented, and to be the culmination to which they pointed.

An evaluation of the theory resulted in the conclusion that while it cannot be said to be generally accepted, it offers a solution for the problem of the extra material of the Third Gospel which merits consideration, and it is sufficiently well defended to warrant its being assumed as an hypothesis for an investigation of this kind.

A detailed study of the content of the Proto-Luke document followed with special attention to the points of contrast between the material found here and that of the Mk. - Mt. tradition.

In the third section a review of the source criticism of the Fourth Gospel revealed four main types of theory: (a) the traditional conception of

Johannine authorship; (b) the extreme critical position which denies the traditional conception; (c) the mediating position which recognizes a source in the reminiscences of an eye-witness; (d) the partition theories which posit a written source. The last is a variation of the third.

In the fourth section we dealt with the question of the relation of the Fourth Gospel to Synoptic material. A brief review of criticism in its treatment of this problem showed that a use of Mark by the writer of the Fourth Gospel is generally recognized. The problematical point is the question of the relationship between the Fourth Gospel and the First and Third. Since, however, the latter only has a bearing on this investigation, it was found possible to limit this discussion to a consideration of the question of the relationship between the Fourth Gospel and canonical Luke. A study of points of contact between these two documents followed. As a result of this study we arrived at the conclusion that there is a relationship existing between them. A study of the extent of this relationship led to the conclusion that it was much closer between the Fourth Gospel and Proto-

Luke than between the former and canonical Luke as a whole, a situation which proved a unique connection of some kind between Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel; a connection, however, which is not to be explained by a theory of direct documentary dependence on the part of either.

In section five we considered possible explanations for this relationship existing between Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel and by a process of elimination arrived at a theory of a common source or basis in a common cycle of tradition. An application of the theory to the phenomena which had been previously noted showed this theory to be an adequate explanation for all. We, therefore, arrived at the conclusion that the theory of origin in a common cycle of tradition is the most satisfactory explanation of the relationship which has been shown to exist between Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel for the following reasons.

(a) Because it is the theory to which we were driven by a process of elimination.

(b) Because it explains all the phenomena.

(c) It explains some phenomena for which no other theory gives an adequate explanation.

(d) It is in harmony with the most approved position of the source criticism of the Fourth Gospel.

Finally, we considered the significance of the theory of a common origin for Proto-Luke and the Fourth Gospel, first for the latter and then for the former. As a result we reached certain conclusions on this point.

(a) That this theory of common origin is of importance for Fourth Gospel criticism (1) It shows that extra-Synoptic material in the Fourth Gospel is based on an early tradition. (2) It points to a connection of this source with John the son of Zebedee. (3) It furnishes a criterion for judging the content of this source. (4) It is evidence for the historicity of the Fourth Gospel.

(b) That the theory of a common origin for these two writings is also of importance for Proto-Luke.

(1) It yields pragmatic support for the Proto-Luke theory. (2) It increases the historical value of Proto-Luke. (3) It points to the conception of a Zebedean source for the early strand of Proto-Luke material.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

** Abbott, E.A. — The Johannine Vocabulary. A Comparison of the Words of the Fourth Gospel with those of the Three. London: A. and C. Black, 1905.
Review of the above:
Drummond Jas. Hibbert Jour. 4 (1906), 442.

** Augustine, A. — "The Harmony of the Evangelists" in Marcus Dods (editor) The Works of Aurelius Augustine.
A new translation Vol. VIII.
Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1873.

** Bacon, B.W. — An Introduction to the New Testament. N.Y.: Macmillan, 1900.

** _____ — "A Turning Point in Synoptic Criticism." Harvard Theol. Review. 1(1908), 48-69.

** _____ — The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate.
N.Y.: Moffat, Yard Co., 1910.

** Bartlett, J.V. — "The Sources of St. Luke's Gos-

pel" in W. Sanday (editor), Studies in the Synoptic Problem by members of the University of Oxford. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.

** Beyschlag, W. New Testament Theology or Historical Account of the Teaching of Jesus and of Primitive Christianity According to the New Testament Sources. Translated by N. Buchann 2 vols. Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1895.

Bousset "Die Offenbarung Johannis" in H. A.W. Meyer, Kritisch exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, XVI, p. 44f. 5th ed. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1896.

** Bruce, A.B. The Synoptic Gospels in the Expositor's Greek Testament. Vol. 1. N.Y.: Hodder and Stoughton, 1917.

** Bultman, R. "The New Approach to the Synoptic Problem." Jour. of Relig. 6 (1926), 336-362.

pel" in F. Sanday (editor), Studies in the Synoptic Problem by members of the University of Oxford. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.

** Beyschlag, W. New Testament Theology or Historical Account of the Teaching of Jesus and of Primitive Christianity According to the New Testament Sources.
Translated by K. Busbann 2 vols. Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1895.

Bousset "Die Offenbarung Johannis" in H. A.W. Meyer, Kritisch Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, XVI, p. 44.
5th ed. Gottingen: Vandenbeck and Ruprecht, 1896.

** Bruce, A.B. The Synoptic Gospels in the Expositor's Greek Testament. Vol. 1. N.Y.: Hodder and Stoughton, 1917.

** Bultman, R. "The New Approach to the Synoptic Problem." Jour. of Relig. 6 (1926), 330-332.

This is a discussion of the formgeschichte method of investigation as applied to a study of the Synoptic tradition.

** Burkitt, F.C. The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus. Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1910. This writer emphasizes the superior historical value of Mark over Matthew and Luke.

* _____ The Gospel History and Its Transmission. Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1906.

** Burton, E.D. A Short Introduction to the Gospels. Revised by H.R. Willoughby. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press, 1926. He recognizes three stages in the development of the Fourth Gospel.

** Carpenter, J.E. The Johannine Writings. A Study of the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1927.

* Chrysostom, S.J. The Homilies on the Gospel of St. Matthew. Translated with notes and indices. Part 1 Horn 1-XXV. Oxford: J.H. Parker, 1843.

* Drummond, James An Inquiry into the Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel. London: Williams and Norgate, 1903.

** Easton, B.S. "Linguistic Evidence for a Lucan Source L." Jour. of Bib. Lit. 28-29 (1909-10) 139-180. Based largely on the work of B. Weiss in Evangelium des Lukas.

* _____ The Gospel According to St. Luke. A critical and exegetical Commentary. N.Y.:Scribner's,1926. Review of this book by F.C. Grant in Anglican Theological Review. 9 (1926-27), 64f.

Eichhorn, J.G. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Leipzig: in der Weidman-

ischen Buchhandlung, 1804.

* Eusebius, P. The Ecclessiastical History. Translated from the Greek by the Rev. C.F. Cruse with notes selected from the edition of Valesius, London: Geo. Bell & Sons, 1879.

* Evans, E.P. The Life and Works of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing.
From the German of Adolf Stahr. Boston: William V. Spencer, 1866. Bk. 12. Lessing as a Theologian a valuable discussion of the Wolfenbuttel Fragments.

** Evanson, E. The Dissonance of The Four Generally Received Evangelists and the Evidence of Their Respective Authenticity Examined. Ipswich: Geo. Fermyn, 1792.
Drastic and well adapted to arousing opposition.
The Gospel of Luke is the only one recognized as authentic.

** Feine, P. Eine Vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas in Evangelium und Apostelgeschichte. Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1891.

* _____ Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1913.

Freytag, G.A. Die heiligen Schriften des Neuen Testaments. Berlin:: Alexander Jonas, 1861.
Decidedly radical.

* Gabelein, A.C. The Gospel of John. A Complete Analytical Exposition of the Gospel of John. N.Y.: Publication office of Our Hope, 1925.
An extremely conservative position.

** Garvie, A.E. The Beloved Disciple Studies of the Fourth Gospel.
N.Y.: Doran, 1922.
The "Beloved Disciple" a rich young Jerusalemite.
Three strands in the Gospel.

Gieseler, J.C.L. Historisch - kritischer Versuch

über die Entstehung und die fruhesten Schicksale der schriftlicken Evangelien. Leipzig: Wilhelm Enzelmann, 1818.

* Godet, F.A. — A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke. Translated from the second French edition by E.W. Shalders and M.D. Cusin. 2nd. ed. N.Y.: J.K. Funk & Co., 1881.

_____ — Commentary on the Gospel of St. John with a critical introduction. 2 vols. Translated from the second French edition by Frances Crombie and M.D. Cusin. Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1876.

** Harnack, A. — Luke the Physician. N.Y.: Putnam's 1907.

* _____ — Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur. 2 vols. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichsche 1904.

** Hawkins, J.C. — Horae Synopticae Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem. Oxford: Clarendon

* Coxeter, H.S.M. _____ Geometry on the Sphere. N.Y.:
Macmillan, 1948.

* _____ Introduction to Geometry. N.Y.:
Wiley & Sons, 1961.

** Hadwiger, H. Altes und Neues über die Kreiszahl π.
Mathematisch-Naturwissenschaftliche Blätter,
Leipzig, 1940.

** Hadwiger, H. Vorlesungen über Inhalt, Oberfläche und Isoperimetrie. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1957.

** Hadwiger, H. Altes und Neues über Flächeninhalt. Comm. Math. Helv., 1950.

** Hadwiger, H. Gitterpunktanzahl im Simplex und Willssche Vermutung. Math. Ann., 1956.

** Hadwiger, H. Gitterpunktanzahl im Würfel und Minkowskischer Satz. Math. Z

Press, 1899.

** _____ "Three Limitations to St. Luke's use of St. Mark's Gospel", in W. Sanday (editor) Studies in the Synoptic Problem. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.

** Hayes, D.A. John and His Writings. N.Y.: Meth. Book Concern, 1917. Conservative position.

** Holdsworth, W.W. Gospel Origins. A Study in the Synoptic Problem. N.Y.: Scribner's, 1913. No narrative matter in "Q". Different collections used by Matthew and Luke.

Holtzmann, H.J. Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das neue Testament. Zweite verbesserte und vermehrte auflage. Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebech), 1886.

** Hunkin, J.W. "The Composition of the Third Gospel with Special Reference to

Canon Streeter's Theory of Proto-Luke."
Jour. of Theol. Studies. 28 (1926-27), 250-262.
Here we find opposition to Streeter.

** Jackson, H.L. "The Present State of the Synoptic Problem" in H.B. Swete (editor), Essays on Some Biblical Questions of the Day. London: Macmillan, 1909.

Jones, Maurice The Four Gospels, Their Literary History and Their Special Characteristics.
N.Y.: Macmillan, 1921.
Luke's story of the Passion, the deposit from his missionary preaching which owing to the influence of St. Paul emphasized the Cross and the Resurrection.

* Jülicher, A. An Introduction to the New Testament. Translated by Janet Penrose Ward.
London: Smith Elder Co., 1904.

** Lessing, G. "Neue Hypothese über die Evangelien als blos menschliche Geschichtschreiber betrachtet." vol. 17. in C. Gross (editor) Sammtliche Werke. Berlin: Gustar Hempel, 1751-1755.

* Lightfoot, J.B. Biblical Essays. N.Y.: Macmillan 1893.

Loisy, A. Le Quatrieme Evangile Deucieme Edition refondue Les Eputres Dites De Jean. Paris: Emile Nourry, 1921.

_____ L'Evangile selon Luc. 1924.

** McGiffert, A.C. A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age. N.Y.: Scribner's, 1923.

* McNeile, A.H. An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927. Gives general approval to Streeter's Four-Document hypothesis.

* Moffatt, J. An Introduction to the Litera-

ture of the New Testament.
N.Y.: Scribner's, 1927.

* Montefiori, C.G. The Synoptic Gospels. Edited with an introduction and commentary in two volumes. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1927.

** Parsons, E.W. A Historical Examination of some non-Markan Elements in Luke.
Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1914.

** Patton, S.P. Sources of the Synoptic Gospels.
N.Y.: Macmillan, 1915.

** Perry, A.M. The Sources of Luke's Passion Narrative. Chicago: Univ of Chicago Press, 1920.

** _____ "Proto-Luke and the Chicago Theory of the Synoptic Problem." Jour. of Bib. Lit. 47(1928), 91-116.
An attempt to find in the Proto-Luke theory support for E.D. Burton's theory of a Galilean source.

* Pfleiderer, O. Christian Origins. N.Y.: B.W. Huebsch, 1906.

* Plummer, A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke. N.Y.: Scribner's, 1900.

Réville, A. Jesus de Nazareth Etudes critiques sur les antecedents de l'histoire Evangelique et la vie de Jesus. Paris: Librarie Fischbacher, 1897.

* Robinson, B.W. The Gospel of John. A Handbook for Christian Leaders. N.Y.: Macmillan, 1925.

** Sanday, W. The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel. N.Y.: Scribner's, 1905. Quite conservative.

** _____ "The Conditions under which the Gospels were written in their Bearing upon Some Difficulties in the Synoptic Problem." in W. Sanday (editor) Studies in the Synoptic Problem. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.

** _____ "Jesus Christ" in Jas. Hastings, (editor), A Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. II, N.Y.: Scribner's, 1899.

Schleiermacher, F. "Ueber die Schriften des Ludas, ein kritischer Versuch", 1817 in Sammtliche Werke Erste Abtheilung. Zur Theologie. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1836.

** Schmiedel, P.W. The Johannine Writings. Translated by M.A. Canney London: A.and C. Black, 1908.

* Smith, D. The Disciples Commentary. 3 vols. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928. Conservative and devotional in character rather than critical.

Soltau, W. Unsere Evangelien, Ihre Quellen und Quellenwert vom standpunkt des Historikers aus betrachtet. Leipzig: Theodore Weicher, 1901.

Spitta, F. Das Johannes-Evangelium als Quelle

der Geschichte Jesu. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.

** Stanton — The Gospels as Historical Documents. Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1920.

** Stephenson, T. — "Fresh Light on the Synoptic Problem" Jour. of Theol. Studies. 23(1921-22), 250-255. A discussion of Streeter's presentation of the Proto-Luke theory in the Hibbert Journal of Oct. 1921.

** Streeter, B.H. — "Fresh Light on the Synoptic Problem" Hibbert Journal 20 (1921-1922), 103-112.

** _____ — The Four Gospels. A Study of Origins. N.Y.: Macmillan, 1925.

Reviews of the above:

* E.F. Scott Yale Review. 15 (1925-26), 609-610.

* M. Dibellins Theologische Literaturzeitung. 51(1926) 74-75.

B.S. Easton Anglican Theol. Review, 8(1925-26), 256-263.

** Taylor, V. "The Alleged Neglect of M. Alfred Loisy". Hibbert Journal 24(1925-26), 563-575.

** _____ "Behind the Third Gospel. A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis." Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926.

** Taylor, V. "Is the Proto-Luke Hypothesis Sound?" Jour. Theol. Studies. Jan. 1928. 147-155.

** _____ "The Synoptic Gospels and Some Recent British Criticism." Jour. of Relig. April, 1928, p. 225-246.

** Anon Review of the above; Jour. of Theol. Studies. 28(1926-27), 199-201. A favorable review.

* Westcott, B.F. An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels. 7th ed. London: Macmillan, 1888.

* _____ The Gospel According to St. John with Introduction and notes. London: John Murray, 1882.

* Weiss, B. A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament. 2 vols. Translated by A.J.K. Davidson. N.Y.: Funk and Wagnallis, 1889.

_____ in H.A.W. Meyer Kritisch exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament Zweite Hälfte Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas achte auflage Gottingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1892.

Weisse, C.H. Die Evangelienfrage in ihrem gegenwartigen Stadium. Leipzig: Breitkorpt und Hartel. 1856.

Wellhausen, J. Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien. Berlin: G. Reimer 1905.

** Wendt, H.H. The Gospel According to St.

John. An Inquiry into its Genesis and Historical Value. N.Y.: Scribner's, 1902. Translated by Edward Lummis.

_____ Die Schichten in vierten Evangelium. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911.

* Wernle, P. The Sources of our Knowledge of the Life of Jesus Christ. Translated by Edward Lummis. Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1907.

** Wickes, R. The Sources of Luke's Perean Section. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1912.

* Wrede, D.W. The Origin of the New Testament. Translated by Jas. Hill. London, N.Y.: Harper Bros., 1909.

_____ Charakter und Tendenz des Johannesevangeliums. Tübingen und Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1903.

* Wright, A. Some New Testament Problems.

London: Methuen & Co., 1898.

* Zahn, T. _An Introduction to the New Testament._ Translated from the third German edition under the direction of Melancthon Williams Jacobus. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909.

_____ _Das Evangelium des Johannes unter den Handen seiner neuesten Kritiker._ Leipzig: A Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf, 1911.

** Zimmermann, H. "Lukas und die Johanneische Tradition." _Theologische Studien und Kritiken._ 76(1903) 586-605.

Two stars mark the books that have been read through carefully, one star those in which the sections applicable to the problem have been read. Those not marked have been scanned with sufficient care to discover the writer's general position and their value for this investigation.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED.

Bacon.	I.N.T.	Introduction to the New Testament.
	F.G.R.D.	The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate.
Burkitt.	G.H.T.	Gospel History and its Transmission.
	E.S.	The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus.
Feine.	V.U.L.	Eine vorkanonische überlieferung des Lukas.
	E.N.T.	Einleitung in das Neue Testament.
Hawkins.	H.H.	Horae Synopticae.
	O.S.S.P.	Studies in the Synoptic Problem by members of the University of Oxford.
Loisy.	E.L.	L'Evangile selon Luc.
	Q.E.	De Quatrieme Evangile.
Sanday.	C.T.G.	The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel.
	O.S.S.P.	See above.
Weiss.	I.N.T.	See above.
	E.K.N.T.	Kritisch exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament.
Zahn.	I.N.T.	See above.
	Evang. Johan.	Das Evangelium des Johannis.

BIOGRAPHY.

Name: Rhoda Christena Edmeston.

Birthplace and date of birth: Blyth, Ontario, Canada, November 27, 1892.

Parents: James Boyd Edmeston.
Barbara Toll Edmeston.

Birthplace of father: Blyth, Ontario, Canada.

Birthplace of mother: Baden, Ontario, Canada.

Education of candidate: Graduate of the following:
Blyth High School, 1908.
(with honors)
Hamilton Normal School, 1916.
(with honors)
Chicago Training School, 1924.
(with honors)
A.B. degree from University of Denver, 1925.
A.M.degree from Boston University, 1926.
1926-1928 Residence work in Boston University Graduate School, for Ph.D. degree.
1928-29 Completion of require-

BIOGRAPHY.

ments for Ph.D. degree.

Positions held: Teacher in the grade schools of Ontario 1912-15, 1917-22.

Pastor of Methodist Episcopal Church, Round Pond, Maine, during the summers of 1927 and 1928.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1 1719 02484 2561

F

NO